

January 26, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

1067

They are capable, as the business world has discovered. Handicapped employees gladly contribute their efforts and are often more adroit in an area than the average employee. A local jeweler hires the handicapped almost exclusively to perform with painstaking care the tedious tasks of repairing watches. Another case in point is a 29-year-old man who has a responsible, well-paying job at Sears and Roebuck. (Sears and Roebuck was among the first to realize the value of hiring the handicapped.) This young man is a conscientious worker who attends church faithfully and has taken up music as an avocation. He lost his speech when he was 14 years old. He could have withdrawn and lived on sympathy, but he too refused to conform to the world's idea of handicapped.

A third handicapped person who could easily have yielded to discouragement has proved to be not only a capable, active citizen, but a great inspiration to those that have the privilege of knowing her. She was 17 years old when both legs and one arm were amputated in an automobile accident. After being fitted with artificial limbs, she returned to her job in the city water department, later married, and now has a son.

One woman, whose father had lost his right leg as a result of a bone disease, demonstrates admirably the attitude that is typical of those who have been near the handicapped and who know their potential. When asked if she knew of any handicapped person, she thought for a moment and then replied, "No, I don't think I do." She did not cripple her father with her attitude.

These are just a few examples from my own community that can be multiplied a hundred times over in communities throughout the land. The physically handicapped, the mentally retarded, the emotionally disturbed are capable of living useful lives and contributing to humanity. The greatest handicap placed upon them is the attitude of those who are fortunate enough to be mentally and physically whole. Through ignorance, or perhaps through fear, people have set aside the handicapped as not quite a part of humanity, not quite capable of the deep emotions of all humanity. But they are capable and are willing to contribute to mankind. And they will—if only we let them.

#### WHAT HANDICAPPED WORKERS ARE CONTRIBUTING TO MY COMMUNITY

(By Sandra Thompson, age 16, home, 1425 West 131st Street, Compton, Calif., school, 2808 North Central Avenue, Compton, Calif.)

"Just give them a chance, that's all they need." Those who are handicapped are a great asset to the community; if given a chance they can prove to be just as capable as a person who is not handicapped.

Once I heard an interesting story of a man who had been in an automobile accident and had lost one of his hands. The names that are used are fictitious ones, but the incident is very true. Joe, our main character, was out one day taking a leisurely drive when some person, not watching what he was doing, came up from a side street and hit Joe from the side. Joe was injured quite seriously and when everything was finally over, the doctors informed Joe that they would have to amputate one of his hands. When he heard this, he was quite upset, because the job he had held required much work with the hands, and what good was he with only one hand?

When Joe was released from the hospital, he had to find some sort of a job because he had a family to support. One day Joe saw a friend who told him that many factories and small shops hired handicapped people. He went from day to day, from place to

place, looking for someone who would hire a man with only one hand. Joe began to get discouraged, but he was a very determined person and he would not let his discouragement stop him from getting a job.

One day Joe went to a small factory where toys were made and repaired. After a short interview, Joe was told that he would be hired. He was very happy, although he was not completely satisfied. When he started to work, he made a good enough salary to support his family and to have enjoyment. Joe worked on this job for a long time and soon worked his way up to an executive position. This made him and his family very happy. As the years went by, this small factory adopted a motto which read, "Just give them a chance, that's all they need."

#### FREE WORLD SHIPS SERVICING THE VIETCONG

(Mr. DICKINSON (at the request of Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, in his news conference of January 21, Secretary Rusk was asked by an Australian correspondent this question:

Don't you think there is something incongruous in the fact that the British are supplying by ship munitions and other materials to the Vietcong while Australians, who are part of the British Commonwealth, are fighting the Vietcong?

To this Secretary Rusk replied in part:

Many of these free world ships go in empty in order to bring our fresh fruits and vegetables.

Mr. Speaker, this is shocking. On January 12, 1966, Mr. Rusk's own spokesman, Robert J. McCloskey, announced—according to the Associated Press—that North Vietnam imported \$12.2 million "in ships operating under flags of non-Communist nations."

The Department of Defense publicly admits to 119 free world ships entering ports servicing the Vietcong during 1965. January 25 the Washington Post reported that Soviet Mig jet fighters are turning up in crates in North Vietnam, apparently having been shipped by sea, no one knows how.

For the information of the Secretary of State, the only vegetable North Vietnam grows is sweet potatoes, and fruit is not one of its products.

On January 3, in response to a telegram from me to the President, I was informed by his administrative assistant, Henry J. Wilson, Jr., that the matter of ending these free world shipments to North Vietnam was under consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the President publicly to instruct the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense to halt immediately all free world and other shipping into North Vietnam. Americans are dying fighting communism in Vietnam. Our enemies there must not be supplied.

I call for the U.S. fleet to be ordered, if necessary, to halt these shipments. We have the example of Cuba when this was done even though American fathers, sons, and husbands were not involved as they are in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therewith an article in this connection from the Mobile, Ala., Press:

#### SHOE IS ON OTHER FOOT IN RHODESIAN RELATIONSHIP

While this Nation has yielded to pressure from the British in applying economic sanctions against Rhodesia, it is interesting to note that the shoe is on the other foot insofar as Britons dealings with Castro Cuba are concerned.

Many of the major British shipping concerns have voluntarily refused to trade with Cuba, but records compiled by the U.S. Maritime Commission reveal that during 1965 a total of 119 vessels of British registry visited Cuba.

In addition, the latest figures on free world trade with Cuba compiled by the U.S. Department of Commerce reveal that Britain and Canada with a total of \$55 million in exports to Cuba in the first 6 months of 1965, matched the combined total of 13 other free world countries trading with Cuba.

It then becomes evident that the British Empire, while putting the thumb screws on Rhodesia through the United States, has not cooperated to any degree in our efforts against Cuba, or for that matter, in Vietnam.

Canadian exports in the 6 month period were \$30 million while British exports to Cuba were \$25 million.

It is not beyond the realm of possibility that the goods being traded to Cuba are American goods flowing through Canada or England.

Now is the time for the United States to take a firm stand on this issue.

If economic sanctions are to be applied by the United States against Rhodesia, let us insist that like economic sanctions be applied by the British and the Canadians against Cuba and certainly against North Vietnam.

Uncle Sam has long been a soft touch in his dealings of this nature. That image should be changed immediately. If there is one facet of the Asian situation in which irreparable damage could be done to the free world cause it would be the loss of face. To lose face or to appear to be weak could easily wreck the confidence of other Asian nations in the strength and determination of the United States.

This we cannot afford short of writing off southeast Asia, abandoning it to the Communists, and returning home like a licked dog with his tail between his legs.

#### DUTY ON CHRISTMAS GIFTS TO MEN IN VIETNAM

(Mr. GURNEY (at the request of Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I was recently shocked to learn from families in my District that they had to pay duty on Christmas gifts sent to them by fathers and sons in Vietnam.

I am introducing legislation today to allow servicemen in combat zones to send gifts of up to \$50 without being charged duty.

The present regulation allows a gift package valued at less than \$10 to be sent from foreign countries without payment of duty as long as only one package is sent to a person on any day. For a serviceman stationed in a noncombat zone, this is a minor inconvenience that he can get around by mailing separate packages on different days.

But in Vietnam the picture is different. Boys have little opportunity to shop, wrap and mail packages and must often do so on one hurried trip to the PX. So they mail several gifts together and the family pays the duty.

Mr. Speaker, these boys and their families have enough to worry about without this. Christmas for military families with Dad in Vietnam is not such a happy occasion at best. The least we can do is make their gift giving a little easier by relaxing this unrealistic ruling.

The bill I am introducing allows a package valued at \$50 or less to go duty free. I think this is a fairer figure that will cover most gift purchases made by servicemen.

The Congress enacted a similar law during World War II and I am hopeful that we can do the same for our men in Vietnam.

#### DIFFICULTIES FOR LOCAL AND STATE GOVERNMENTS IN SUPPORTING PUBLIC SCHOOLS

(Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama (at the request of Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret to any of us that local and State governments are finding it extremely difficult to pay for adequate support of public schools.

Over the past 15 years the costs of education have gone up about 700 percent. State and local expenditures for education have increased almost the same amount over the same period of time.

In the next few years the costs of education are expected to increase at almost the same rate. But State and local governments simply cannot continue to raise their expenditures at the same rate.

The reason for this is not hard to find. They have reached the saturation point in their ability to tax. Their sources of revenue have run out. The State income tax and sales taxes, the local property taxes and other revenue devices have been utilized to capacity.

Few responsible persons have any quarrel with the idea that public education requires our most difficult attention. To say that education provides the key-stone of our country's future economic and social structure is to repeat a truth that hardly needs repetition.

This truth was, however, repeated in many different forms and at considerable length in this Chamber over a 3-day period last March when the House passed legislation designed to aid elementary and secondary education.

Many generalities regarding the importance of education were put forth as justification for specific legislation which should have been improved at that time. Instead, it was passed into law, and many persons, some here in Washington, some in State education departments, and many others in local school administrative positions around the country, are now wondering if our action of last year could not have been improved.

The schools now face a mass of differing regulations affecting a multitude of programs. The problem is such that it not only raises a question of just how effective our action of last year can be in meeting the basic financing needs of the schools, but in addition it costs the schools considerable leeway in running their own affairs.

In October of 1965 the New York City superintendent of schools, speaking to members of the Public Education Association, said that decisions involving school policy should be made locally and not by legislation. He said that strings attached to Federal aid programs were causing many educators to wonder whether "the schools will be run locally or from Washington."

Our top educators have expressed similar concern. School superintendents from the Nation's 52 largest cities, at a meeting in Memphis last fall, discussed this matter at considerable length.

It would be a mistake for us to believe, at least at this time, that education legislation approved by Congress over the past 2 years will provide satisfactory solutions to the school financing crisis.

Perhaps our legislation and its approach reflects limitations of attitudes here in Washington. It may be well to broaden our outlook and embark on an entirely new approach as a means of providing a bold new solution to a vexing problem which promises not to go away.

I believe that approach can be found in the concept of sharing Federal tax revenues with the States for the purpose of aiding our schools.

I had hoped that this year we could have definite evidence of a move toward reducing nonessential Government spending so that Federal taxes could be reduced accordingly. This would permit, first, a balanced national budget, and secondly, more opportunities for State and local government to broaden their own tax potential so as to be better able to meet the rising costs of public education.

But our hopes in this regard are now shown to be disappointed. According to the best available analysis of the Presidential budget announced this week spending for programs which are generally labeled as "Great Society" programs is scheduled to increase by \$3.2 billion in the coming year.

And instead of anticipating tax reductions we are being asked to actually increase taxes with the restoration of the automobile and telephone service excises and the speeding up of tax withholdings, plus other kinds of increases which are being predicted for the coming months.

This all leaves our schools with a problem which deserves early attention. For that reason I am introducing a bill today to provide for a program of tax sharing with the States.

The Federal income tax is the broadest source of tax collection. There is good reason to believe that revenue from this source should be shared with the States on a "no strings" basis as a means of greatest help for our public school systems.

Further, there should be no partisan

issue raised over this question. Leading public officials of both major political parties have advocated this kind of plan. And several bills have been introduced, advancing variations of the idea.

My bill provides that when it is fully operational 5 percent of the revenue received from the Internal Revenue Code and the Tariff Schedule would be deposited in an educational assistance trust fund.

The program would be 5 years in building. In the first year of operation 1 percent of the total revenue would be deposited in the fund, in the second year 2 percent would be contributed, and so forth until 5 percent is deposited in the fifth year and thereafter.

Disbursements would be handled two different ways. Half of the funds would be distributed to the States on a per student basis. The other half would be allocated according to a formula based on the percent of its gross personal income a State is already spending on its State schools.

Each State would qualify only by guaranteeing that it would use the money for education purposes and by showing that it operates in fact in accord with that understanding. This would allow each State to determine its own education priorities.

This plan would not raise taxes. But it ought to provide badly needed help to public schools throughout the country by combining the strength of the Federal revenue system with local control of schools which is a basic essential of our system.

It is my hope that we may bring this proposal, along with others which have been introduced, to the point of active consideration in this Congress so that we may move forward with genuine help for our schools.

#### EDUCATION AND TRAINING ASSISTANCE FOR VETERANS

(Mr. LANGEN (at the request of Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, our involvement in the Vietnam war has served to highlight the sacrifices being made by our men in the Armed Forces. Let us properly recognize the contributions to national and international security being made by the 190,000 American men serving their country in Vietnam and the many other GI's supporting them on tours of duty elsewhere.

As draft calls for our young men increase, and the resulting interruption of educational and career plans becomes more prevalent, it becomes the serious responsibility of the Congress to extend GI educational benefits to veterans of current and recent service. In furtherance of this most worthy objective, I am today introducing a bill providing for a program of education and training assistance for veterans of military service since January 31, 1955.

It has long been the purpose of this Nation to encourage the pursuit of academic and vocational achievement. But



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 112

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 26, 1966

No. 11

## House of Representatives

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., recited this verse of Scripture, Job 28: *Behold, the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom; and to depart from evil is understanding.*

Most merciful and gracious God, in this day may we be sensitive and responsive to Thy commands and demands in behalf of noble living and heroic service.

Grant that our faith may not be denuded of life and loveliness and may we not look upon life with disgust and bitterness but with deeper reverence and concern and love for all mankind.

Give us a clear vision of our high duty and destiny and may we be guided by its appeal and feel it filling us with confidence and power and inspiring us to be faithful at all times.

Help us to realize that Thy words are less a command than an invitation and that we must heed them if we are ever to find the meaning of life and reach its goal.

To the glory of Jesus Christ, our Lord.  
Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

### CUT OUT LEGISLATION BY REGULATIONS

(Mr. JONES of Missouri asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include a letter from Dr. L. M. Garner, acting director of the Division of Health of Missouri.)

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, once again my attention has been directed to a practice by a Federal bureaucracy which would subordinate or actually nullify the laws of many sovereign States of this Union, merely by the writing of a regulation, which in my opinion is contrary to and not in the spirit of the

laws passed by this Congress. I appreciate and am aware of the fact that some Members feel that the States have no rights, but I am predicting that some of these same Members will be in a most uncomfortable position when they try to defend a Federal agency which has indicated that it will not recognize nor accept a delayed birth certificate issued by the State, as proof of age, when the elderly citizens of their State are denied benefits which are due them under laws passed by this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, there is already enough redtape involved in any program of the Federal Government, without the pandemonium which will exist when our elderly citizens make application for benefits under the medicare program, only to be informed that the delayed legal certificate of birth, issued by the State of their birth is not recognized by the Social Security Administration.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the State of Missouri is in the unique position of being the only State, whose delayed certificates of birth are not recognized by the Federal Government, or at least are questioned by the Social Security Administration, and for that reason, I have asked permission to have printed herewith as a part of my remarks, a letter from Dr. L. M. Garner, acting director of the Division of Health of the State of Missouri, setting forth some of the difficulties which have already arisen in Missouri, and which in all likelihood already prevail in other States. It should not require legislation to correct this situation, but if legislation is necessary, I hope that the Members of this House will cooperate in correcting this inequity to save our elderly people further frustration and additional expense:

THE DIVISION OF HEALTH,  
CITY OF JEFFERSON, MO.,  
January 21, 1966.

HON. PAUL C. JONES,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE JONES: As you no doubt are aware, the Missouri Division of Health, through the Bureau of Vital Statistics, is assigned the responsibility for the registration of births. Chapter 193 of the Revised Statutes of Missouri, 1959, sets forth the methods by which delayed birth cer-

tificates may be issued to Missouri residents whose births had not previously been registered.

Many elderly citizens of this State who were born prior to 1910 when Missouri law provided for the registration of births can only obtain such a certificate by submitting proof from various documents so that the possibility of fraud may be eliminated insofar as is humanly possible.

On November 22, 1965, the Social Security Administration issued a rule of internal policy which will work a very real hardship on a great number of elderly Missouri citizens and their families. The rule in question directs the social security field representative to require additional evidence of age when the claimant presents a delayed birth certificate as proof of age. There are many other requirements to the directive, but we have been unable to obtain a copy of the directive since it is an internal management rule. With the advent of medicare, approximately 500,000 elderly people in the State of Missouri will be eligible for increased social security benefits. Applications for such delayed birth certificates are being received in this office at the rate of 50 to 75 per day, and approximately 90 percent of these are for applicants who are over the age of 60. We believe that most, if not all, of these applications are being made so that they may be used as a proof of age for social security benefits.

Now, as a result of the new internal rule of the Social Security Administration, the applicant will have expended much time and money to secure a certificate which is no longer acceptable for the purpose for which it was obtained. Unless certificates issued in accordance with Missouri law, or for that matter in accordance with the laws of other States, are acceptable as evidence for social security purposes, then the purpose and spirit of State statutes are completely frustrated and the elderly citizens are greatly handicapped in securing the benefits provided under the expanded social security law.

As a personal favor to me and for the benefit of all of our elderly citizens, I would like to request your assistance in this problem.

Respectfully,  
L. M. GARNER, M. D.,  
Acting Director.

### SUPPORT OF U.S. POLICY IN VIETNAM

(Mr. SELDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)



Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, along with other Members of the House, I received a letter yesterday from Mr. Virgil Musser, president of the National Young Democrats. The purpose of Mr. Musser's letter which, incidentally, was dated 18 days prior to its receipt, was to disclaim Young Democrats participation in a January 8 Constitution Hall rally in support of President Johnson's Vietnam policy.

The January 8 rally, sponsored by the Young Americans for Freedom, was a bipartisan expression of support for the efforts of our fighting men who are bearing the brunt of the Nation's commitment to protect South Vietnam from Communist aggression.

I was privileged to be asked to speak at the rally, and did so, along with our colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee, Congressman Brock. The text of my speech follows:

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE ARMISTEAD SELDEN, "LIGHT UP FOR FREEDOM" RALLY, IN SUPPORT OF U.S. POLICY IN VIETNAM, CONSTITUTION HALL, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 8, 1966

"America," wrote Emerson, "is a country of young men."

I am honored to be here tonight at this "Light up for Freedom" rally of young Americans.

You have chosen as your symbol for this rally the torch—the torch of freedom. In preparing my remarks for this occasion, I could not help but recall that it was 5 years ago—almost to the day—when America's youngest President chose the symbolism of the torch of freedom in his inaugural address.

"Let the word go forth from this time and place," he said, "that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans—born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage—and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world."

Let me repeat the last part of that inaugural quotation: "disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage—and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world."

Disciplined—proud of our heritage—unwilling to stand by while aggression threatens the freedom of our fellowmen throughout the world—I think these are the qualities reflected by this gathering of young Americans here tonight.

These are the same qualities—brought to the ultimate test—which sustain and ennoble the efforts of young Americans honoring our Nation's commitment in Vietnam this very night.

Discipline—pride—and commitment to freedom—have always been the qualities which distinguished this country of young men—and the young men of this country.

That is why the undisciplined, self-abasing, and uncommitted Vietnā protest marchers of recent months reflect not a national movement or mood, but only their own sickness.

They are a mockery of all those symbols which freemen hold dear.

They call for "peace"—but they mean surrender of our Nation's commitment to the people of Vietnam.

They distort the symbol of the torch itself, so that in their hands it becomes not

an affirmation of man's hope, but a negation of that hope.

Are these the "young men" of whom Emerson wrote? Do they speak for—or reflect—America in 1966?

No. They do not speak for America—or for the conscience of America—or for young Americans.

They certainly do not speak for or reflect anything remotely resembling the new generation of Americans represented here tonight at this rally.

Young Americans are in Vietnam to honor a commitment. It is not simply a policy commitment to Vietnam, but rather a larger commitment which relates to our national heritage. A commitment, as was said in that address 5 years ago, to the freedom of men.

The history of this century teaches that nations which seek to take the easy course in the face of suggestion pay a severe penalty.

In the 1930's, the Western democracies sacrificed smaller nations to aggression and paid the price—in terms of moral stain and aggression ultimately aimed at their own national interests.

So it would be in the 1960's were we to sacrifice South Vietnam. Aggression which succeeds begets larger, bolder aggression. The aggressors' target is not simply the sphere of southeast Asia. It is the Western Hemisphere.

Were we to take the easy course in Vietnam, we would soon be faced with Vietnamese subversion and aggression by Communist and Communist-inspired enemies of freedom throughout Latin America.

As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, I know the volatile nature of that threat. The Communist and their friends in Central and South America—encouraged and aided by Peiping—would need only the indication that the American will to resist in Vietnam was weakening.

We would then witness a quantum jump in the Communist technique of so-called wars of national liberation. Our own hemisphere would be the battleground.

Considering these and other fearful possibilities, were we to abandon our commitment in Vietnam, I am reminded of what the late Winston Churchill said during the early years of World War II.

Then, too, there was a vocal peace claque at work, urging that somehow, in some way, the war should be ended and a peace signed with Hitler. Churchill spoke of these critics of his government's war policy as "thoughtless dilettanti or purblind worldlings."

"They sometimes ask us," said Churchill, "What is it Britain and France are fighting for? To this I answer," said Churchill, "If we left off fighting, you would soon find out."

Today there are those in our own country and elsewhere who ask: "What is it that America is fighting for in Vietnam?" And like Churchill, our answer is: "If we left off fighting, you would soon find out."

Americans now fight, as did England in that day, on the front lines in the defense of freedom. Disciplined, proud, committed to our national purpose—we will continue to fight so long as there are those in the world who would extinguish the torch of freedom in free, independent countries.

Hitler was deceived by the thoughtless dilettanti and purblind worldlings of that former day into believing that Churchill's England did not possess the discipline, pride, or spirit of commitment to carry on and win the war.

The Communist aggressors of South Vietnam—and throughout the world—will be similarly deceived if they look to the thoughtless dilettanti and purblind worldlings whose protests against America's commitments in Vietnam represent only their own sick spirits.

I opened my remarks with a quotation from the inaugural of one American Presi-

dent 5 years ago. I will close with a quotation from another inaugural, delivered 9 years ago, January 21, 1957. This is fitting, for the commitment which we have made in South Vietnam transcends political party or administrations. It is a national commitment—to take up and carry the torch of freedom.

"May the light of freedom," said President Eisenhower, "coming to all darkened lands, flame brightly—until at last the darkness is no more."

"May the turbulence of our age yield to a true time of peace," he concluded, "when men and nations shall share a life that honors the dignity of each, the brotherhood of all."

Based on information supplied by the organizers of the rally, the gentleman from Tennessee, Congressman Brock, and I sent a letter to other members explaining the purpose of the meeting and stating, incidentally, that the Young Democrats were among the organizations cooperating in the rally. This information, according to Mr. Musser, was erroneous, although the following letter from Mr. David R. Jones, executive director of the Young Americans for Freedom, indicates otherwise:

YOUNG AMERICANS FOR FREEDOM, INC.  
Washington, D.C., January 25, 1966.

HON. ARMISTEAD SELDEN,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SELDEN: Your administrative assistant telephoned me today about the form letter which is being sent, apparently, to all members of Congress by a Virgil Musser, national president of the Young Democrats. As I understand it, it alleges that Young Americans for Freedom falsely claimed that the Young Democrats were a cosponsor of the "Light up for Freedom" rally held on January 8, 1966, in Constitution Hall. The letter goes on to state, I believe, that the Young Democrats did not play any such role in the rally and have taken this means to set the record straight. We, too, would like to set the record straight.

1. The letter which you and Congressman Bill Brock, of Tennessee, graciously consented to sign did not refer to any group as a cosponsor of the rally. The letter does refer to cooperation tendered YAF by various groups, including the Young Democrats.

2. Young Americans for Freedom contacted both the College Young Democrats and the Democratic National Committee here in Washington, D.C., about the January 8 rally. We were told by representatives at each office that they would distribute materials about the rally. We mailed such materials to the College Young Democrats and delivered in person those materials to the Democratic National Committee. At no time were we told not to deliver such materials by either office.

3. At other rallies the weekend of January 7 and 8, in Boston, Philadelphia, St. Louis, Cleveland, Houston, and California we received wonderful cooperation from many different groups including the Young Democrats. For example, in Boston the Young Democrats along with the Young Republicans cosponsored the January 7 rally with Young Americans for Freedom. Speaker John McCormack sent a letter endorsing the rally and stating that he wished that he could be present. The mayor of Boston, a Democrat, also sent a message to that rally. The Governor of Missouri, a Democrat, endorsed the rally in St. Louis. The mayor of Houston, a Democrat, endorsed the rally there. And so it went across the country.

It was on the basis of such cooperation and such information that we contacted both you and Congressman Brock about distributing

January 26, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

1053

a letter to other Members of Congress as well as to their staffs. We regret this minor tempest in a teapot, which continues to be aggravated by certain Young Democrats, although we firmly believe that the overwhelming majority of the Young Democrats and indeed all Americans are behind the U.S. policy of firmness in Vietnam. After all, Congressman, it never occurred to us that the Young Democrats would not be willing to cooperate in publicizing a rally which supported our Government and our fighting men at a critical time.

With deep appreciation for your cooperation and understanding, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

DAVID R. JONES,  
*Executive Director.*

In any event, the president of the Young Democrats declares, and rather vehemently, that his organization did not participate in this rally in support of the President's policy in Vietnam. As a Democrat, I regret that they did not do so—and I am disappointed, to say the least, that the Young Democrat leadership desires to go to such great lengths to disassociate their organization from a cause which supports the policy of a Democratic President.

Nor only as a Democrat, but as a Member of Congress who felt a definite need for responsible American youth to take action to offset the irresponsible activities of the Vietnark draft card burners and pseudo-pacifist demonstrators, I was most grateful that the Young Americans for Freedom sponsored such a rally and that I was invited to participate.

I have sent the following reply to Mr. Musser, a copy of which already should have reached your desks:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., January 25, 1966.

Mr. VIRGIL L. MUSSER,  
President, Young Democratic Clubs of America,  
Democratic National Committee,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MUSSER: I am in receipt of your letter of recent date regarding the Young Democrats' failure to participate in the January 8 Constitution Hall rally in support of the President's stand in Vietnam.

I stand corrected regarding your organization's role in this Young Americans for Freedom rally. As a Democrat who backs the President's policy of firmness against Communist aggression, I regret the national Young Democrats' failure to participate in what was an inspiring and much-needed bipartisan expression of the American people's support of their fighting men in Vietnam.

Since your organization did not participate in the January 8 Vietnam freedom rally, I presume you are making plans for a program of your own along these lines. If this is the case, please let me know, as I would be pleased to participate.

Sincerely yours,

ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR.

DR. HUGH L. ELSBREE

(Mr. BURLESON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include a letter.)

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I have learned that Dr. Hugh L. Elsbree, Director of the Legislative Reference Service in the Library of Congress, is retiring from that position.

We all know the good work done for

our offices by the Legislative Reference Service but many times I think we fail to appreciate the burdens placed on the Service because of the increasing workload of the Congress. As chairman of the Committee on House Administration and as chairman and vice chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library, it has been my pleasure to know Dr. Elsbree. He is an outstanding public servant whose qualities of leadership are self evident and he has done a fine job during his 7½ years as Director of the Service.

I was therefore pleased to hear that Dr. L. Quincy Mumford, the Librarian of Congress, has presented Dr. Elsbree with the Library's highest citation—the Distinguished Service Award. I include with my remarks the letter from Dr. Mumford to Dr. Elsbree which accompanied the award:

JANUARY 20, 1966.

Dr. HUGH L. ELSBREE,  
Director, Legislative Reference Service,  
Library of Congress,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HUGH: It is with the deepest personal as well as official regret that I must accept your decision to retire as Director of the Legislative Reference Service.

As I look back over your career, you seem to me to be the very model of the distinguished public servant. Your academic training—not one but three degrees in political science from Harvard—was impeccable. Before you came to the Government more than two decades ago your attainments as a college teacher, a productive scholar, and an administrator in academe's well-known groves were already of a high order. I like to think, however, that it was the Legislative Reference Service, which you joined in November 1945, that gave full scope to your learning and your talents. It afforded challenges, ever new and ever greater, which, however impossible they seemed, you never failed to meet.

You not only had the learning necessary for a top staff specialist, specifically as senior specialist in American Government and public administration, but you had the instincts for such service—the necessary self-effacement but also the self-confidence born of knowing your subject and how to apply it to problems of public policy, the ability to define issues and to present alternatives, and the scholarly objectivity but also the realistic grasp of the politically possible.

Your unusual capacities were widely recognized, so much so that it was difficult for the Legislative Reference Service to hold onto you. For nearly 4 years (1952-56) you served part-time as managing editor of the American Political Science Review. When I came to the Library in 1954 you were on loan to the newly created Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, where, as Deputy Research Director, you earned high praise for the successful completion of the Commission's task. After your return to the Library in 1955, I was happy to appoint you as Deputy Director of the Legislative Reference Service. Although in 1957 you yielded briefly to the lures of the academic life, it was my proud accomplishment to bring you back to public service in 1958 as Director of LRS upon Dr. Griffith's retirement.

It was the Library's good fortune, as well as the Congress and the Nation's, to have you in charge these past 7½ years. It has been a period of phenomenal growth in congressional responsibilities, both in scope and complexity, and consequently in demands on the Service. The pressures on you and on your able staff, coupled with the dislocations caused by building renovations and by space and staff shortages, have often been, I fully

appreciate, almost unbearable. It is a tribute to your leadership, I am sure your staff would all agree, that the Service has met the challenges of the times, while I am equally sure that you would insist that it was due to your staff's dedication. The truth is that it is due to both. However, your ability to discover, attract, and develop talent, your personal integrity, your standards of excellence, your sound judgment, your profound understanding of the requirements of the Congress, your skill in public administration, and your fine qualities as a human being have not only maintained an admirable esprit de corps but have enabled the Legislative Reference Service to fulfill its highest duty—to be responsive to the needs of the Congress.

At the same time, your deep interest in the Library of Congress as an institution, your appreciation of the principles for which it has stood for over a century and a half, and your understanding of its many faceted role in the research community, both public and private, have made you a most valued adviser to me.

For all these contributions, for a Federal career that reflects nothing but honor on you, on the Legislative Reference Service, on the Library, on the Congress, and on the Government, I present to you with gratitude the Library's highest citation the Distinguished Service Award.

I am sure that the entire Library staff joins me in wishing you and Eugenia a healthy, happy retirement.

Sincerely yours,

L. QUINCY MUMFORD,  
Librarian of Congress.

## JUSTICE STUDIES ARLINGTON CASE

(Mr. BENNETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the umbilical cord of bureaucratic redtape has been cut, and justice for the memories of millions of war dead will apparently be served with the announcement by the Department of Defense that they have asked the Department of Justice to render an opinion on the proposed burial of convicted Communist conspirator Robert G. Thompson in Arlington National Cemetery.

I hope the Department of Justice can make a speedy decision to permit the rejection of the burial of disloyal persons in Arlington and that the Department of Defense will formulate clear regulations which would promptly remove all doubt on this policy of Government in all future cases.

To bury such persons in our graveyard of heroes is like burying Judas Iscariot in St. Peter's Basilica in Rome.

## FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION BILL

(Mr. MCCARTHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the recently passed Federal aid to education bill is already having a beneficial effect on western New York schoolchildren.

As a result of the Primary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, \$589,451 has already been channeled into schools in the congressional district I represent.

The amounts and the school districts follow:

Alden.....	\$32,194
Frontier.....	65,070
Lancaster.....	58,125
Dewey.....	27,514
Amherst Central.....	31,240
Amherst District 13.....	19,090
Amherst District 18.....	19,378
Sweet Home.....	46,341
West Seneca Central.....	60,071
Akron.....	35,540
Cheektowaga Central.....	32,465
Sloan.....	50,173
Maryvale.....	64,476
Cleveland Hill.....	47,774

In the past decade, local debt for public education has increased by nearly 400 percent, and many school districts have reached the limit of indebtedness.

Federal aid is indeed a blessing to heavily taxed property owners and debt-burdened school districts. But local control and initiative are most important. The law is written to encourage the interest and initiative of interested citizens in the local schools. The educational decisions are made at the State and local levels—not here in Washington.

#### POSTAL BUDGET

(Mr. OLSEN of Montana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, a week ago the Post Office Department announced a massive program to accelerate mechanization and modernization of the Nation's postal system. The initial phase of that program involved installation of mail-handling equipment in 109 post offices throughout the Nation, and the total mechanization program was to cost about \$65 million by June 30, 1966.

Following that announcement, members of our Post Office and Civil Service Committee, myself included, enthusiastically endorsed the new plans and programs for the Postal Establishment. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Facilities and Modernization I was looking forward to working closely with the Department in carrying out its plans for improved mail service.

On Monday the 1967 budget came to this Congress. The total asked for postal research, development, and engineering—the real basis for any approach to modernization and mechanization—is \$16 million. With defense spending zooming to \$61.4 billion—and \$5.5 billion of that for research and development—the Post Office Department has again presented a research budget totaling only 0.002 of its budget. There is no business of any size in the country today that could seriously expect to grow and improve with such a shortsighted investment in research. I cannot overemphasize the seriousness of this refusal to face the realities of the 20th century at a time like the present when the efficiency and speed of delivery of the mail are of paramount importance to the strength and safety of the Nation.

Our three postal subcommittees, which recently made a firsthand study of European postal systems, have recommended that the Post Office Department budget for research and development be substantially increased and that pro-

grams of research be employed to develop new systems, to evaluate old concepts, and to provide the tools for keeping pace with a mail explosion of 2 billion pieces annually.

It is now clear that the \$65-million program announced by the Post Office last week is a retooling operation, not a modernization program. Without a basic research program to link this operation to a systematic effort to modernize the entire postal complex, the Department may soon find itself with \$65 million in outmoded machinery.

The budget figures submitted Monday also make it clear that if the Post Office Department is to have a realistic research program, we in the Congress are going to have to take the initiative.

(Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. PRICE'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

#### SENATE CONFIRMATION OF ANY NEW DIRECTOR OF THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to your attention and that of the House the fact that a bill requiring Senate confirmation of any new Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the FBI, is pending before the House after passing the Senate last May 24.

An article by the well-known columnist, Ralph de Toledano, in a recent issue of Human Events gives alleged reasons for delay in this measure being reported out of the Judiciary Committee. I do not have confirmation of these reasons, but I do know that the need to act fast is clear from other assertions in this article.

By unanimous consent, I introduce in the Record the article in Human Events:

[From Human Events, Jan. 15, 1966]

COMING: A BATTLE OVER THE FBI—WILL THE BUREAU BE POLITICAL OR EFFICIENT?

(By Ralph De Toledano)

When Congress convenes there will be a determined push by security-minded Members of the House for legislation to require Senate confirmation of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This is at once a tribute to the incumbent, John Edgar Hoover, and an indication of suspicion for the wheeling-and-dealing aspects of the Johnson administration.

A bill to this effect has already been passed by the Senate. In the House of Representatives, however, Chairman EMANUEL CELLER, of the Judiciary Committee, has done his utmost to prevent the measure from reaching the floor. There is an ironic angle to this, given Mr. CELLER's bitter criticism of other chairmen who have bottled up legislation.

Mr. CELLER and the Democratic liberals in the House have argued that preventing a committee from taking up a bill—and therefore preventing a vote by the Congress—is violative of the democratic process. By a not-so-very-odd coincidence, they have waived this argument whenever legislation that they favor has been held up.

What is at stake in the case of the FBI succession bill is the control of FBI files and the future use of the Bureau for purposes which have little to do with the investigation of crime—and nothing at all with the war on subversion. In the years of the Kennedy-Johnson administration, the FBI has been under tremendous pressure from Attorneys General ROBERT F. KENNEDY and Nicholas deB. Katzenbach. There has been criticism of Mr. Hoover in some quarters for presumably bowing to this pressure. But if there is any truth in this, it is far more noteworthy that he has been able to hold the line so well.

When Mr. Hoover retires, the administration will be in a position to appoint a man who is far more malleable. This is the fear of those who press for legislation which will give the Congress a check on the new Director. At present the man who will influence the choice, when Mr. Hoover terminates his long and honorable service, is Attorney General Katzenbach. And it is Mr. Katzenbach who has been lobbying most persistently against the proposed change.

In a way, it is understandable why Mr. Katzenbach wants to retain his power over FBI Directors. The new appointee will not be buttressed by the tremendous prestige which has made the FBI relatively impregnable under Mr. Hoover. The need for congressional approval will force the administration to find a man of stature—not a hack, crony, or ideologue.

There are reports on Capitol Hill that the administration has already begun the build-up on its choice. He is Adam Yarmolinsky, who was singled out by Congress for political extinction when he was being touted for an important post in the antipoverty war. Like a phoenix, however, Mr. Yarmolinsky returned to prominence as Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Security Affairs.

If it is not simply the kind of self-propelled scuttlebutt which floats down House and Senate corridors, then there would be some semblance of sense in this new honor for Mr. Yarmolinsky. The word "security" is now part of his title, much to the shock and chagrin of legislators here, and could be used to enhance his credentials.

Congress, of course, would never have it—and this, to bring this account full circle, is why there will be a considerable push to make the appointment of an FBI Director subject to senatorial consent.

#### AUTHORIZATION FOR ADDITIONAL CLERICAL HELP

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 690) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 690

Resolved, That effective February 1, 1966, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, until otherwise provided by law, such sums as may be necessary for:

1. Additional clerical help in the Office of the Majority Leader, not to exceed \$3,000 (basic) per annum.

2. (a) An additional position in the Office of the Minority Leader, the basic compensation of which shall be at a rate not to exceed \$2,500 per annum.

(b) An additional position in the Office of the Majority Whip, the basic compensation of which shall be at a rate not to exceed \$2,500 per annum.

(c) An additional position in the Office of the Minority Whip, the basic compensation of which shall be at a rate not to exceed \$2,500 per annum.



with a mandate from the voters, and giving the Nation a chance to approve or disapprove, in mid-term, of the way the President has been operating. The logical solution is a 4-year House term with half the Members standing for election every 2 years. Our Government would be far healthier for it.

#### ESTABLISHMENT OF THE NATIONAL CAPITAL PARKS MEMORIAL BOARD

Mr. JACKSON. Madam President, at the request of the Secretary of the Interior, I introduce for proper referral a Senate joint resolution to provide for the establishment of the National Capital Parks Memorial Board. I ask unanimous consent that the letter of transmittal that accompanied the request for introduction be made a part of the record at this point. The letter signed by Stanley A. Cain, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, sets out the Department's explanation of the proposal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 129) providing for the establishment of the National Capital Parks Memorial Board, introduced by Mr. JACKSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The letter presented by Mr. JACKSON is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, D.C., December 9, 1965.  
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,  
President of the Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed joint resolution "Providing for the establishment of the National Capital Parks Memorial Board."

We recommend that the enclosed resolution be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and we recommend that it be enacted. We believe that enactment at the present time is urgent.

The joint resolution creates a National Capital Parks Memorial Board which will prepare and recommend to the Secretary of the Interior broad criteria, guidelines, and policies for memorializing persons and events on Federal land in the National Capital Parks System. The Board will examine proposals made for memorials and make recommendations thereon to the Secretary of the Interior.

The Board will be composed of nine members, as follows: Five appointed by the President of the United States; the Chairman of the Fine Arts Commission; the Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission; the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia; and the Director of the National Park Service. The members of the Board will receive no salary but may be paid expenses incidental to travel while engaged in discharging their duties as members of the Board.

Memorializations place a constant demand on park land of the Nation's Capital. There are 100 memorials of the monument or statue type already existing on land in the National Capital Parks System. A number of others have been authorized but not yet constructed. In the 88th Congress alone numerous bills were considered with respect to 13 separate proposals, 2 of which were enacted into law. A similar pattern has been repeated in the prior Congresses. It is evi-

dent that, if the concept of open space and dignity which contribute so much to the beauty of the Nation's Capital is to be preserved in the face of constant pressures to use the land for memorials, sound guidelines for the control of this use must be formulated, a comprehensive plan must be developed, each proposal must be carefully evaluated, and sound criteria must be steadfastly followed. In fact, such a plan offers the only assurance that sites will be available for future memorials that in all respects merit a location in the parks.

We recommend the establishment of the Memorial Board as a means of meeting the critical situation which confronts the National Capital Parks System. The Board will provide an effective method for focusing attention on the problem, and will help all concerned to view the numerous proposals in proper perspective.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,  
STANLEY A. CAIN,  
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

#### DRAFTEES SHOULD NOT BE SENT TO SOUTHEAST ASIA INVOLUNTARILY WITHOUT CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL—AMENDMENTS TO SENATE BILLS 2791, 2792, AND 2793

AMENDMENTS NOS. 481, 482, AND 483

Mr. GRUENING. Madam President, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I send to the desk three proposed amendments to bills—S. 2791, S. 2792, and S. 2793—now under consideration by the Senate Committees on the Armed Services and Foreign Relations. Those bills authorize additional military and AID programs for Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent that these amendments be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I also ask that these amendments lie on the table for 3 days, to give others an opportunity to cosponsor them, and that they then be printed and be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendments will be printed in the RECORD, and lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Alaska.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Madam President, I am offering these amendments to all three bills because there is no way of ascertaining at this time which of these bills will first come before the Senate for action and also because I believe that they should be considered by both committees.

These three amendments are identical and provide simply that persons drafted into the armed services should not be sent to southeast Asia involuntarily without congressional approval.

On August 20, 1965, I had intended to offer a similar amendment to the defense appropriation bill then pending in the Senate. That morning the President asked to see me at the White House. The purpose of our meeting was to enable me to explain to the President in detail my opposition to our military in-

volvement in Vietnam, which I had been voicing on the floor of the Senate for a year and a half. I told the President that I disagreed completely with his administration's position, that three Presidents had pledged support to this policy—that there was in fact no national pledge or an unavoidable commitment—that we had in fact asked ourselves into Vietnam. I also elaborated on my other reasons for believing that our involvement was folly—that it was a war we could not win—that continuation there would lead to greater and greater disaster.

While there, after I expressed my views, I told him I intended to introduce an amendment that very afternoon forbidding draftees to be sent to southeast Asia involuntarily without the consent of the Congress. The President earnestly urged me not to introduce the amendment. He said that in any event no draftees would be sent to Vietnam before January. After repeating his request that I take no such action, he said that if we were not out of Vietnam by January, I would be free to do anything I pleased.

In view of the President's request and his statement to me: "If we are not out of there by January you can do anything you please," I agreed to and did withhold my amendment.

Immediately upon returning to my office, I sent the President by special messenger a copy of my proposed amendment and the remarks I had prepared to make in support of my amendment on that afternoon. These I transmitted to the President with an accompanying letter. I ask unanimous consent that that proposed amendment, my proposed remarks, and my letter to the President of August 20, 1965, be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. GRUENING. Madam President, more than 5 months have now elapsed. We are still bogged down in an undeclared war in Vietnam which threatens to escalate into a third world war and the price of which in any event in lives and other costs would be staggering.

While I disapprove entirely of our involvement in Vietnam, it becomes clear that those who have enlisted in any of the Armed Forces have an obligation to go where their Commander in Chief sends them. "Theirs is not to reason why."

But an entirely different situation prevails when we reach into millions of American families and conscript these youths to fight involuntarily in this hopeless mess.

Since there apparently is no intention to ask for a declaration of war, this amendment will serve as a vehicle for Members of Congress to express themselves on an issue which strikes home in a literal sense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. GRUENING. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to continue for an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

January 26, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1123

tion. Having served as a Member of the House for 16 years from a marginal district which was not safe in any election, I know whereof I speak. A Congressman simply cannot perform his duties diligently and conscientiously in this era of increasingly complex issues if he is forced to spend the bulk of his time mending his political fences back home.

For this reason, I agree with President Johnson on the need to lengthen the terms of Congressmen. But I disagree as to when they should be elected.

Electing the President and the House of Representatives at the same time, as President Johnson proposes, deprives the public of any opportunity to correct the excesses of a strong President or the mistakes of a weak one. For 4 long years there would be no way to counsel, check or advise the President of alterations in public sentiment. A midterm election of the House, on the other hand, would give notice to a President of the sense of the public will.

The idea of electing Congressmen and, indeed, Senators for terms to run currently with that of the President has been advanced by those seeking to legitimize in the United States the doctrine of part responsibility. Under this doctrine, Members of the Legislature are supposed, for all practical purposes, to be subservient to the President. They are supposed to run on his coattails every 4 years and then be at his beck and call. An independent-minded Representative would be a rarity.

This doctrine may be fine for political systems like the British where a premium is placed on party discipline in Parliament. But this concept is alien to American politics. Our parties are not meant to be monolithic. They are coalitions of diverse groups and interests which reflect the variety and diversity that is America. A subservient Legislature is contrary to the purposes of the authors of our Constitution who created a Congress that is coequal to and independent of the executive branch of Government. These considerations underlie my opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 126. This is why I am offering my proposal as an alternative to that recommended by President Johnson.

I want to point out that neither my resolution nor Senate Joint Resolution 126 should be regarded as the only measures required to strengthen Congress, so as to enable it better to discharge its responsibilities effectively. The Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, the so-called Monroney-Madden committee, is presently studying many proposals designed to revitalize and strengthen Congress so that it can effectively meet the challenges confronting it in the years ahead. I joined in sponsoring the resolution which created that committee, have offered recommendations to it, and am following its deliberations with keen interest and anticipation. I hope that its work will result in improving the organization and procedures of our National Legislature so that it can be restored to its coequal status in the triumvirate comprising our National

Government and that it can merit the confidence of the electorate which chooses its Members.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my proposed resolution together with an editorial from the current issue of *Life* magazine which opposes the idea of electing the President and Congressmen concurrently be printed in the *Record* immediately following my remarks. I also ask unanimous consent that my resolution lie on the table for 7 days in order to give my colleagues an opportunity to add their names as cosponsors.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will lie on the desk as requested, and the joint resolution and editorial will be printed in the *Record*.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 128) to amend the Constitution as to the length of terms of Representatives in the U.S. House of Representatives, introduced by Mr. SCOTT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

## S.J. RES. 128

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:*

## "ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The terms of Representatives shall be four years and shall commence at noon on the 3d day of January of the second year after the year of the regular term of the President is to begin.

"SEC. 2. No member of a House of Congress shall be eligible for election as a Member of the other House for a term which is to begin before the expiration of the term of the office held by him unless, at least 30 days prior to such election, he shall have submitted a resignation from such office which shall become effective no later than the beginning of such term.

"SEC. 3. This article shall take effect on January 3, 1975, if it is ratified prior to January 1, 1974."

The editorial presented by Mr. SCOTT is as follows:

[From *Life* magazine, Jan. 28, 1966]

## CONGRESSMEN NEED 4-YEAR TERMS

Of all the proposals put forth by President Johnson in his state of the Union message, the most popular with the assembled Congressmen, to judge from their applause, was the suggestion that Members of the House of Representatives ought to have 4-year terms, running concurrently with the President's. "The present 2-year term," Johnson said, "requires most Members of Congress to divert enormous energies to an almost constant process of campaigning—depriving this Nation of the fullest measure of both their skill and their wisdom."

"A Congressman," runs an old Capitol Hill gag, "is the shortest distance between 2 years." Plenty of men in and out of Government are prepared to testify to the wastefulness of the present system. Yet though during the last 40 years well over 50 proposed

constitutional amendments to extend the term to 4 years have been introduced, none got anywhere. But no President ever pushed for the change the way Lyndon Johnson has.

The Founding Fathers compromised upon the 2-year term after considerable haggling. Elbridge Gerry would have preferred a 1-year term, in the belief that annual elections were "the only defense of the people against tyranny." James Madison felt that at least 3 years were required for a Representative to surmount local interests and get a sense of the country at large. Alexander Hamilton, with his mistrust of excessively popular rule ("Your people, sir, is nothing but a great beast"), also favored the longer term.

Defenders of the 2-year term still contend, much as Gerry did, that frequent elections are necessary if the people are to keep a checkrein on their representatives, and make them answer for what they do. This is not a bad argument, but it was better in 1787 than it is today, when so much more is demanded of a Congressman both in work done in Washington and campaigning done at home.

Nor is it pertinent to argue that only about 100 out of 435 legislators need to worry much about being reelected, since the rest come from "safe" districts. The men most threatened are often exactly those whose caliber and promise are greatest; tough races generally bring out the best candidates. Furthermore, the job security of a 4-year term would help attract higher quality men.

Doubling the House term is a sound idea. But should it be concurrent with the President's term as Johnson suggests? In the past, off-year elections have been a nuisance to the White House. Only once in this century (in 1934) has the President's party failed to lose House seats in the off year, and frequently it has lost control of Congress altogether. While the length of the presidential coattails is a matter of dispute (Johnson, for example, carried many Democrats into office with him in 1964, though in 1956 Eisenhower didn't get a Republican majority in either the House or the Senate), the newly elected Chief Executive usually has a sympathetic House during the first half of his term.

A friendly Congress means that the President has an easier time getting his programs passed into law, and so far as this amenability contributes to joint responsibility of the legislative and the executive it is a good thing. But a too agreeable Congress can be an inadequate counterweight to a strong executive, and with no off-year House elections the problem is likely to be compounded.

Johnson avoids the charge of power-collecting on his own behalf by proposing that no changes take place until 1972, when he possibly will have completed his second term. But as Prof. James MacGregor Burns points out in his brilliant new book, "Presidential Government," the Johnson administration represents a high point in the historic drift toward White House domination of the entire Government. The wish for concurrent House and presidential terms must be considered in this light.

Burns goes on to show that powerful forces like reapportionment and a general appetite for liberal programs are already driving Congress into the President's pocket. The danger for the future is no longer inefficiency and stalemate, but what he calls "the corruption of consensus," the stagnation which lies at the heart of too much presidential success.

It seems gratuitous to speed this process by making House terms jibe in toto with that of the President. The Senate has always got along well by dividing its membership into three 6-year "classes" so as to stagger elections 2 years apart. The House must represent a balance between providing a responsible area of support for an elected President



January 26, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1125

Mr. GRUENING. Madam President, the President has sought no declaration of war from that branch of the Government which alone is authorized under the Constitution to declare war—the Congress.

Of course, I can understand the difficulty the President would face in seeking a declaration of war. Against whom would he ask Congress to declare war?

Declare war against the Vietcong—or the National Liberation Front—which is one of the two parties involved in the civil war in Vietnam?

Declare war against North Vietnam only, which is now supplying the Vietcong—but where would that leave the Vietcong?

Declare war against Red China—which to date has not committed a man for combat, and is giving little material aid to Vietcong—although shouting much encouragement?

Declare war against Russia—which also is sending materiel to fan the flames of the discord in Vietnam?

It is important, therefore, before further draftees are sent to southeast Asia to fight a ground war in the steaming jungles of Vietnam that each Member of the Senate have an opportunity to express whether—absent such a declaration of war—draftees should involuntarily be sent to southeast Asia.

My amendments will afford an opportunity for each Senator to stand up and be counted.

When I call up my amendment—and I shall do so at the appropriate time—each Senator will have to ask himself these questions:

Is it fair, without an express authorization to that effect by the Congress, for draftees to be sent involuntarily to Vietnam to fight and perhaps die there while well-trained men of the Regular Armed Forces are not fully utilized in the fighting in Vietnam?

Is it fair, without an express authorization to the effect by the Congress, for draftees to be sent involuntarily to Vietnam to fight and perhaps die there while well-trained men in the Armed Forces Reserves—on whose training we have been spending annually well over one and three-quarter billion dollars—are not fully utilized in Vietnam?

Is it fair, without an express authorization to that effect by the Congress, for draftees to be sent involuntarily to Vietnam to fight and perhaps die there while over 300,000 well-trained, experienced troops are stationed in Europe?

I appreciate the fact that, when I call up my amendment, there is a risk that a motion will be made to table it or to amend it in such a way as to nullify its clear purpose. I hope if such a motion is made, it will not be made until there has been open and prolonged debate on the floor of the Senate on every single aspect of the crisis in Vietnam, including how we became involved there and whether we have exhausted very single legal avenue in our search for peace.

But if there is a motion to table my amendment, or to nullify it by amendment, let no one here remain unaware of how a vote to table will be interpreted by millions of mothers, fathers, wives,

and children throughout the United States. A vote to table will be interpreted as a vote to send draftees to fight in Vietnam while hundreds of thousands of our regular Armed Forces are undergoing the "rigors" of being stationed in the United States or in Europe—while hundreds of thousands of Reserves are going about their daily civilian jobs, sacrificing only one evening a week or one day a month for which they receive pay.

It is high time this issue was debated. It is high time every Member of the Senate stood up and was counted on our involvement in the undeclared war in Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent that a table prepared for me by the Department of Defense showing the costs of Reserve and Guard Forces for the past 3 years be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

## EXHIBIT 1

To the Committee on Armed Services:

"S. 2791

"Amendment No. 421, intended to be proposed by Mr. GRUENING (for himself and Mr. MORSE) to S. 2791, a bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes:

"On page 3 after line 8 add the following new section:

"Sec. 302. During any period that any Armed Force of the United States is engaged in armed conflict or hostilities in southeast Asia, no person who is a member of that Armed Force serving on active duty by virtue of involuntary induction under the Universal Military Training and Service Act shall be assigned to perform duty in such area, unless (1) such person volunteers for service in such area, or (2) the Congress hereafter authorizes by law the assignment to duty in southeast Asia of persons involuntarily inducted into such Armed Forces."

To the Committee on Armed Services:

"S. 2792

"Amendment No. 482, intended to be proposed by Mr. GRUENING (for himself and Mr. MORSE) to S. 2792, a bill to authorize certain construction in support of military activities in southeast Asia, and for other purposes:

"On page 3 after section 8 add the following new section:

"Sec. 7. During any period that any Armed Force of the United States is engaged in armed conflict or hostilities in southeast Asia, no person who is a member of that Armed Force serving on active duty by virtue of involuntary induction under the Universal Military Training and Service Act shall be assigned to perform duty in such area, unless (1) such person volunteers for service in such area, or (2) the Congress hereafter authorizes by law the assignment to duty in southeast Asia of persons involuntarily inducted into such Armed Force."

To the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"S. 2793

"Amendment No. 483, intended to be proposed by Mr. GRUENING (for himself and Mr. MORSE) to S. 2793, a bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes:

"On page 2 after section 3 add the following new section:

"Sec. 4. During any period that any

Armed Force of the United States is engaged in armed conflict or hostilities in southeast Asia, no person who is a member of that Armed Force serving on active duty by virtue of involuntary induction under the Universal Military Training and Service Act shall be assigned to perform duty in such area, unless (1) such person volunteers for service in such area, or (2) the Congress hereafter authorizes by law the assignment to duty in southeast Asia of persons involuntarily inducted into such Armed Force."

## EXHIBIT 2

H.R. 9221

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. GRUENING to H.R. 9221, an Act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes:

On page 26 change the period to a comma and add the following: "Provided, That, none of the funds provided in this Act shall, except with the prior assent of Congress, be used to pay any of the costs of stationing or assigning, without his consent, any person serving in the Armed Forces of the United States by virtue of involuntary induction under the Universal Military Training and Service Act to duty in southeast Asia."

## DRAFTEES SHOULD NOT BE SENT TO SOUTHEAST ASIA INVOLUNTARILY WITHOUT CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL

Mr. President, I send to the desk a proposed amendment to H.R. 9221, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1966. I ask that the amendment be printed, lie at the desk, and be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

My amendment is simple.

It provides that no draftee can be sent to southeast Asia involuntarily without the consent of the Congress.

The President has now stated publicly—what I have been saying openly time and again for a year and a half now—that the conflict in Vietnam is a war.

He has said:

"It is this lesson that has brought us to Vietnam. This is a different kind of war. There are no marching armies or solemn declarations. Some citizens of South Vietnam, at times with understandable grievances, have joined in the attack on their own government. But we must not let this mask the central fact that this is really war. It is guided by North Vietnam and spurred by Communist China. Its goal is to conquer the south, to defeat American power, and to extend the Asiatic dominion of communism." However, he has sought no declaration of war from the only part of the Federal Government authorized by the Constitution to declare war—the Congress.

It is important, therefore, before further draftees are sent to southeast Asia to fight in the steaming jungles of Vietnam that each Member of the Senate have an opportunity to express whether—absent such a declaration of war—draftees should involuntarily be sent to southeast Asia.

My amendment offers an opportunity for each Senator to stand up and be counted.

H.R. 9221 is the appropriate vehicle for such an expression of opinion by the Senate since it contains a separate section appropriating in title V, at the request of the President, the sum of \$1.7 billion for the southeast Asia emergency fund for use by the Department of Defense.

Theoretically the United States is at peace. Theoretically those called up for the draft for our armed services are being called up to serve in peacetime. If the ground rules are to be changed, it is up to the Congress—which authorized the peacetime draft of men for the Armed Forces—to change these rules.

Let no one doubt the interpretation of the vote which I shall seek on this amendment.

A vote against the amendment or a vote to table this amendment will be a vote to use the peacetime conscription laws to send draftees to fight and perchance to die in what President Johnson has called the war in Vietnam.

This will be an extremely important vote to the thousands upon thousands of mothers and fathers of draftees throughout the country.

If this war in Vietnam is to be fought without the expressed sanction of the Congress then let it be fought by volunteers. With a clear expression of the will of the Congress that it be otherwise, let no draftee involuntarily be sent to Vietnam.

AUGUST 20, 1965.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It was very good of you to see me yesterday and to give me the opportunity to present to you my views on the present situation in Vietnam.

Enclosed is a copy of the speech I had on my desk when I spoke to you yesterday. This was prepared for delivery yesterday and in it I offered an amendment to the defense appropriation bill prohibiting the sending of draftees, without their consent, to southeast Asia. You will recall I spoke to you twice about this, and that at your earnest request I agreed not to introduce this amendment.

In compliance with your wish, I shall not introduce this amendment at this time, although I feel deeply that at the very least the Congress should pass on the sending of our draftees into the war in southeast Asia.

However, as I suggested to you at our meeting, I strongly urge you to announce publicly that—at least until there has been a review of the entire situation after the Congress returns in January or unless a grave national emergency develops—draftees will not be sent to southeast Asia unless they volunteer for such duty. Such a public announcement from you would do much to reassure the people of the United States.

I was pleased to hear from both you and Ambassador Goldberg of the strenuous efforts to secure peace in southeast Asia. As I told you, I was particularly gratified to notice your clarification of your position since your Johns Hopkins speech. Your announcement at your press conference on July 28, 1965, that there would be no particular problem in bringing the Vietcong and the National Liberation Front to the conference table, as I had been urging for some time, was most reassuring.

I was also pleased to hear your changed stand on the reunification of Vietnam through internationally supervised elections as provided for in the Geneva Conventions of 1954. Of course, as I said, it is difficult to convince those with whom we are seeking to arrange a cessation of hostilities of our bona fides while we continue the bombing of North Vietnam.

With best wishes, I am

Cordially yours,

ERNEST GRUENING,  
U.S. Senator.

#### EXHIBIT 3

Department of Defense—Cost of Reserve and Guard Forces  
(In millions)

	Fiscal year 1963	Fiscal year 1964	Fiscal year 1965 <sup>1</sup>
Army Reserve.....	\$372.9	\$379.1	\$368.9
Army National Guard.....	550.0	624.4	649.4
Naval Reserve.....	250.1	273.1	293.2
Marine Corps Reserve.....	82.2	83.1	84.2
Air Force Reserve.....	164.1	172.0	177.7
Air National Guard.....	303.5	351.9	369.2
Total.....	1,722.8	1,883.6	1,932.6

<sup>1</sup> Current estimate; subject to adjustment based on final reports.

NOTE.—The above costs represent obligations in each fiscal year for military personnel and operation and maintenance appropriations, and new obligational authority in the case of continuing appropriations, such as procurement and military construction.

#### ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Madam President, I ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 69, which was reported today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Senate Concurrent Resolution 69, authorizing additional expenditures for the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 69) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

#### S. CON. RES. 69

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, established by Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, Eighty-ninth Congress, agreed to March 11, 1965, is hereby authorized, from February 1, 1966, through December 31, 1966, to expend not to exceed \$140,000 from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the joint committee.

#### INVESTIGATION OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 174, which was reported favorably by the Committee on Rules and Administration this morning, to authorize an investigation of intergovernmental relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 174), as follows:

#### S. RES. 174

Resolved, That S. Res. 59, Eighty-ninth Congress, agreed to February 8, 1965 (authorizing an investigation of intergovernmental relations), is hereby amended on page 2, line 23, by striking out "\$129,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$137,000".

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Madam President, as the Presiding Officer well knows, the authorization of last year expires February 1. The money has already been spent. This additional authorization is necessary to pay for this month's payroll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Carolina? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the resolution is agreed to.

Mr. HART subsequently said: Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which Senate Resolution 174 was adopted be reconsidered and that the motion be laid on the table.

Mr. TOWER. Madam President, reserving the right to object, am I to un-

derstand that the Senator has cleared that matter with the leadership on this side of the aisle?

Mr. HART. I understand that the secretary of the majority has cleared the matter with the minority.

Mr. TOWER. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the motion to reconsider will be laid on the table.

#### ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Madam President, I send to the desk a resolution which was acted upon favorably this morning and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 170) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which was read a second time by title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, as follows:

#### S. RES. 170

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-ninth Congress, \$10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purpose, specified in section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF SENATE BILL 2599

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add my name as a cosponsor of S. 2599, a bill to amend the Urban Mass Transit Act of 1964 to provide for additional technological research.

Today, when over 70 percent of our population lives in urban areas—and the projected figure for 1980 is 80 percent—the Federal Government must increase its participation in developing a dynamic urban transportation system. There is no reason why a government which has developed spacecraft which in the near future will send a man to the moon cannot develop new modes of ground transportation to enable the commuter to reach his place of business and return home quickly, economically, safely, and comfortably.

The Mass Transit Act of 1964 presently authorizes an expenditure up to \$10 million a year for research, development, and demonstration projects in all phases of urban mass transportation. However, it is necessary to look through this veil of language to see what is actually being done. Although research into developing a "futuristic" transportation system would come within the purview of the present language, the money allocated has for the most part

January 26, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1129

of the President's inability so far to deliver on his promise to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. This permits States to ban the union shop requiring employees to join a union to keep their jobs.

About 20 labor leaders were informed of the decision by the Council at a 2-hour briefing this morning in the Executive Office Building. Informed sources said they vigorously objected to the continued use of the 3.2 percent figure.

Organized labor has argued that the old formula for computing the guideposts should be maintained. That would have pushed the guideposts to 3.4 percent because of rising gross national product—output of all goods and services—and to 3.6 percent because the 5 years used in the base for the computation would shift with the start of 1966.

"They just grabbed the 3.2 percent out of the hat," snapped one union leader today. He contended such maneuvers would "destroy any confidence" the public has in the guidelines.

About 20 business leaders met with the Council here yesterday and were briefed on the guideposts. Informed sources said that the meeting was amicable and that the businessmen did not protest the guidepost decision.

Sources said the business leaders did challenge the Government's statement that it was applying the guideposts evenhandedly, contending that prices were being pressured more than wages.

The administration is concerned about inflation because the mounting costs of the Vietnam war are coming at a time when unemployment is at the lowest level since 1957 and labor shortages are cropping up. These conditions make for upward pressure on prices and wages.

Wage settlements negotiated in the first 9 months of last year ran an average 4.1 percent, well above the guideposts.

U.S. Chamber of Commerce officials emerged last week from a meeting with President Johnson and suggested that business and labor impose voluntary restraints on wage and price actions to discourage inflation.

George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, issued a statement today in which he said that "any immediate threat of inflation" was not serious enough to warrant "extraordinary measures." He said there were no restraints on prices and profits, and denied that higher wages were causing inflationary pressures.

## CITIES

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, Americans are known and recognized for our inventive genius.

Americans not only excel in the field of gadgetry, but also in areas of solid, scientific achievement.

Our consumer products make the householder's life easier. We bounce pictures off devices floating in space.

But why can we not, or why do we not, apply our inventive genius to bringing down the costs of housing—particularly for our low- and moderate-income families?

I am not overlooking the efforts of private enterprise and the Federal Government in this field. True, the Federal Government finances a low-income housing demonstration program of grants through the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

But we must do more. We must expand our research activities so that the

benefits of all this experimentation will be made available to all segments of the homebuilding industry.

The Federal Government has a clear-cut responsibility to show the way to a greater volume of homes for lower income families.

Research translated into homes, at prices within the reach of millions of wage earners, is a goal we must reach—not in the coming decades, but in the next few years. We have seen what research has done for industry and agriculture. Why can it not do as much, or more, for home building?

President Johnson's excellent message on the cities clearly states that we can do these things. And it insists that the time to begin is now.

I wholeheartedly concur. *OK*

## ACHESON ON VIETNAM POLICY

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, as is his way, former Secretary of State Dean Acheson has cut through the chaff to the heart of the Vietnamese issue. He has detailed the historical precedent for U.S. actions in Vietnam, which go back to the year 1947 and the Truman doctrine:

I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressure.

Mr. Acheson, in an article which appeared in the Sunday Star for January 16, made it clear why the United States must continue to resist the subjugation of free peoples until the aggressors conclude that cheap victories are not possible and that the cost of aggression is too great. His article speaks eloquently, Mr. President, and scarcely needs amplification. I direct attention to it in the hope that it will help clarify our position as a nation. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Acheson's article, as it appeared in the Washington Sunday Star, January 16, 1966, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## ACHESON ON OUR VIETNAM POLICY: AN ASIAN GREECE

(By Dean Acheson, former Secretary of State)

"I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempting subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressure."

The country referred to was poor, its poverty aggravated by foreign occupation and years of warfare. Guerrillas were creating political chaos and making economic recovery impossible. The existence of the state itself was threatened by large forces supplied, organized, and led by neighboring Communist movements. Many of these forces had taken part in the struggle against foreign occupation.

The Communist leaders had previously signed an agreement for peace but had hidden their weapons and resumed the conflict at the first signs of recovery. The national military forces were unequal to the renewed, foreign aided and directed attack.

The country's government was far from any democratic ideal. Previous aid had proved inadequate. The American government had to decide whether to go further with funds, armaments, and the necessary military advisers. The President's conclu-

sion was summed up in the sentence quoted above.

## THE TRUMAN DOCTRINE

The year was 1947, the country Greece, the president Truman, and the policy enunciated the Truman doctrine. It instantly received bipartisan support in Congress and for nearly 20 years, during four administrations, has been the policy of the United States. Under it necessary help was given in Greece, Turkey, Korea, Lebanon, and now in Vietnam to prevent Communist takeover "by armed minorities or by outside pressure," or by both.

Nineteen years ago, when the policy was first adopted, the United States was in the early stages of its education in methods of Communist conquest. In the immediate postwar years it learned how, in countries occupied by Soviet armies, Communist regimes were set up under their protection and opposition liquidated. This happened throughout Eastern Europe.

The next step was attempted in countries left in confusion by the war but not occupied by Soviet troops. Here internal subversion, instigated and supplied and controlled by outside Communist states, made an armed bid to take over the government. This was the form used in Greece and eastern Turkey. The Truman doctrine labeled this as aggressive Communist expansion and announced the necessity of stopping it. The aggression failed due to massive help given by the United States.

The next stage of the Communist assault did away with pretense. South Korea was openly invaded by organized army units from the Communist base outside. American and allied armed forces successfully came to the aid of South Korea.

## WAR OF LIBERATION

The current method of Communist expansion, employed in Vietnam, is the so-called war of national liberation. In these wars there is an attempt, as there was in Greece, to cloak as an internal insurrection Communist subversion directed and supplied from outside, and there is added a Korea-like invasion by regular army formations from the neighboring Communist state.

Our decision to help South Vietnam resist this attempted subjugation involves principles and policies, all of which were already public and established by 1950. They in turn resulted from an appreciation of the lessons of the 1930's—Manchuria, Ethiopia, the Rhineland, Czechoslovakia—that aggression must either be met early before it has gathered momentum or it will have to be checked later under more adverse conditions.

## SAME OLD COMPLAINTS

The complaints now raised at protest meetings on Vietnam are the same which have been directed against all our efforts to aid peoples resisting Communist subjugation. Our opponents are usually praised and those we are aiding criticized.

We were told that the terrorists, guerrillas, and belligerents in Greece were patriots who had fought the Nazis and whose aim was to replace a corrupt, demoralized government. That the evidence that they were serving foreign Communist purposes was flimsy; and that the United States was intervening in a purely Greek civil war. On the other hand, the Greek Government was denounced as weak, unrepresentative of the people, particularly of the resistance, and as the creature of the Western allies.

Similar unflattering comments were made about the late Syngman Rhee, President of Korea. But the fact now seems too plain for argument that in both Greece and Korea the intervention and help of the United States preserved the opportunity to develop toward democratic government by consent. No such similar development can be noted in neighboring Balkan states or North Korea.



January 26, 1966

So, today, it is argued that government in Vietnam is not and has not been democratic and, therefore, is unworthy of American support. But the existence of a democratic system is not the criterion of worthiness of American support. That criterion is determined and demonstrated effort in resisting attempted subjugation. Can there be more impressive evidence of such determination and effort among the people of South Vietnam than they are now giving. For they are fighting on after suffering military and civilian casualties which on the basis of comparative populations are equal to nearly 1 million American casualties. Their purely military casualties on the same basis are fully 10 times greater than those we suffered in Korea.

When, as in China and Cuba, a government facing Communist-led forces failed to retain the support of its people, its numerically superior forces simply melted away. But in South Vietnam the Government forces continue to grow in numbers and aggressiveness.

Not a single political figure or politically significant group in South Vietnam at the time Diem was overthrown, or since, has shifted allegiance to the Vietcong or been unwilling to continue the struggle.

#### MILLION REFUGEES

Finally, there is the record of those who voted with their feet, the million refugees who left the north for South Vietnam after the Geneva Accords of 1954, and the hundreds of thousands of refugees who in 1965 alone have left Vietcong areas for Government-controlled ones. The South Vietnamese people and army are fully justifying American assistance by willingly continuing to bear the brunt of what remains their struggle for independence.

Fortunately, there is also in Saigon and in Washington not only determination to suppress the belligerency, but an understanding of the importance of political consent in furthering the struggle for independence.

In South Vietnam, even in the midst of devastating warfare, the maneuvering and instability which have characterized the Government since the fall of Diem show both a shift in power and attempts to reach the new balance by taking into account the aspirations of the Buddhists, the Catholics, the civilian politicians, the military establishment, students, the sects, and the geographic regions.

The search for such a balance is not a substitute for political method, but there has also been progress in that direction. Though it seems to have largely escaped public notice, elections for the municipal and provincial councils were held in South Vietnam last May. Observers agree that they were conducted in a fair and orderly manner, and that the candidates substantially reflected local sentiments. Over half the eligible voters were registered and over 70 percent of those registered actually voted. In North Vietnam there can be found, of course, no glimmering of democratic political method.

#### VITAL TO UNITED STATES

The fate of the people of Vietnam is of the same vital concern to the United States as that of those who, in the past, we have helped to resist subjugation. Indeed, the situation in Asia today is reminiscent of the problems the United States confronted in Europe in 1947. The United States faces in Communist China an aggressive nation imbued with the same primitive Communist theology which the Soviet Union had 20 years ago, and possessing (as the Soviet Union did) military resources far greater than those of her neighbors. The area to the south, afflicted by foreign occupation and years of war, offers an invitation to aggression by means of the war of national liberation. Only the United States has the resources to make resistance possible.

The Chinese Communists have made it clear that Vietnam is another test of that strategy in Asia for the aggrandizement of the Communist world. The Communist Chinese Minister of Defense, Marshal Lin Biao, in a speech on September 3, referring to North America and Western Europe as the cities of the world and to Asia, Africa, and Latin America as the rural areas, declared that "contemporary world revolution also presents a picture of the encirclement of cities by the rural areas." In its policy of "encirclement of the cities," southeast Asia has the strategic significance of flanking the Indian subcontinent, facing the Philippines, and straddling the passage from the Pacific to the Indian Ocean.

With appropriate discount for verbal bluster, Communist China has shown an appreciation of the realities of power. There is surely no territory which Communist China desires more ardently than Formosa. Nevertheless, China's recognition of the vast force which the United States can bring to bear in Asia has caused the Communist leadership to refrain from attacking Formosa. The same appreciation of superior might is shown by Chinese unwillingness directly to challenge the United States in southeast Asia.

The American aim in South Vietnam is neither to destroy China nor North Vietnam. It is rather to continue the policy established by President Truman of assisting free nations to resist subjugation until the Communist states become convinced that cheap victories are not possible and that the cost of aggression is too great.

The success of this policy may be seen in the growing moderation which has marked Russian policy in the past 15 years. In time China, too, may grasp the fact that aggression is unrewarding and choose to focus her energies on her vast internal problems while playing a more mature role in the international system.

#### GENERAL WESTMORELAND—TIME'S MAN OF THE YEAR

MR. FONG. Mr. President, the signal honor of being named Time magazine's "Man of the Year" for 1965 has been conferred on a great American—Gen. William Childs Westmoreland, commander of U.S. forces in Vietnam.

It was a most fitting choice. For General Westmoreland personifies the central crisis of our country in this time of conflict and challenge. He represents the courage and the determination of this Nation to face up to the dangers inherent in the Vietnam war. He is "up front" to help make good the American commitment in the struggle against aggression.

It was most appropriate that Time magazine, in selecting General Westmoreland, focused attention on an outstanding military leader in whom this Nation has entrusted the lives of its fighting men in Vietnam and upon whose shoulders will continue to fall the awesome burden of turning the tide of war in our favor. He has already demonstrated the sterling quality of his military leadership in the often frustrating, agonizing conflict in Vietnam.

The skill and drive with which General Westmoreland built up and directed the American forces have been described in impressive detail in Time's cover story. I commend the article to all patriotic Americans.

The people of Hawaii have a particularly warm association with General

Westmoreland because his family is now in Honolulu. Along with 1,800 other dependents, some of whom are living in Hawaii at present, the Westmoreland family was ordered to leave Vietnam last year when the war spread dangerously.

When her husband was chosen Time's Man of the Year, Mrs. Westmoreland responded with the warmth characteristic of the general himself.

He's not just the man of the year but a representative of the men of the year—the troops in Vietnam—

Mrs. Westmoreland remarked in Honolulu.

When he was here last (Dec. 10-18) he told me he couldn't accept the award except as a symbol of the men in Vietnam. Of course, he's been the man of the year in our family for a long time.

In order that more Americans might become acquainted with the personal background of this stalwart military commander, I ask that General Westmoreland's biography be printed in the RECORD at this point, along with a description of the Man of the Year citation in the January 12, 1966 issue of Army Times.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### WESTMORELAND TIME'S "MAN OF YEAR"

NEW YORK.—Gen. William Childs Westmoreland, MACV commander who "directed the historic buildup, drew up the battle plans, and infused the 190,000 men under him with his own idealistic view of America's aims and responsibilities," has been named Man of the Year for 1965 by the editors of Time magazine.

In selecting for the 39th year the man or woman who "dominated the news of the year and left an indelible mark—for good or ill—on history," Time's editors said:

"General Westmoreland was the sneaky personification of the American Fighting Man in 1965 who, through the monsoon mud of nameless hamlets, amidst the swirling sand of seagirt enclaves, atop the jungled mountains of the Annamese Cordillera, served as the instruments of U.S. policy, quietly enduring the terror and discomfort of a conflict that was not yet a war, on a battlefield that was all no-man's land."

"To the quickening drumfire of the fighting in South Vietnam," Time says, "Americans sensed early in 1965 that they might have to choose between withdrawal or vastly greater involvement in the war. By year's end, it was clear that the United States had irrevocably committed itself to the Nation's third major war in a quarter century, a conflict involving more than 1 million men and the destiny of southeast Asia."

The risk and responsibility for the war, Time says, were President Lyndon Johnson's, who "moved resolutely" to make good his pledge to stand in Vietnam, "weathering open criticism from within his own party, strident protest from the Vietnamic fringe and the disapprobation of friendly nations from the Atlantic to the China Sea. \* \* \*

"It fell to the American fighting man to redeem Johnson's pledge. Plunged abruptly into a punishing environment, pitted against a foe whose murderously effective tactics had been perfected over two decades, the GI faced the strangest, toughest war of all \* \* \* with courage and a cool professionalism that surprised friend and foe, U.S. troops stood fast and firm in South Vietnam. In the waning months of 1965, they helped finally to stem the tide that had run so long with the Reds."

"In the process," Time notes, "American troops gave an incalculable lift to South

So, today, it is argued that government in Vietnam is not and has not been democratic and, therefore, is unworthy of American support. But the existence of a democratic system is not the criterion of worthiness of American support. That criterion is determined and demonstrated effort in resisting attempted subjugation. Can there be more impressive evidence of such determination and effort among the people of South Vietnam than they are now giving. For they are fighting on after suffering military and civilian casualties which on the basis of comparative populations are equal to nearly 1 million American casualties. Their purely military casualties on the same basis are fully 10 times greater than those we suffered in Korea.

When, as in China and Cuba, a government facing Communist-led forces failed to retain the support of its people, its numerically superior forces simply melted away. But in South Vietnam the Government forces continue to grow in numbers and aggressiveness.

Not a single political figure or politically significant group in South Vietnam at the time Diem was overthrown, or since, has shifted allegiance to the Vietcong or been unwilling to continue the struggle.

#### MILLION REFUGEES

Finally, there is the record of those who voted with their feet, the million refugees who left the north for South Vietnam after the Geneva Accords of 1954, and the hundreds of thousands of refugees who in 1965 alone have left Vietcong areas for Government-controlled ones. The South Vietnamese people and army are fully justifying American assistance by willingly continuing to bear the brunt of what remains their struggle for independence.

Fortunately, there is also in Saigon and in Washington not only determination to suppress the belligerency, but an understanding of the importance of political consent in furthering the struggle for independence.

In South Vietnam, even in the midst of devastating warfare, the maneuvering and instability which have characterized the Government since the fall of Diem show both a shift in power and attempts to reach the new balance by taking into account the aspirations of the Buddhists, the Catholics, the civilian politicians, the military establishment, students, the sects, and the geographic regions.

The search for such a balance is not a substitute for political method, but there has also been progress in that direction. Though it seems to have largely escaped public notice, elections for the municipal and provincial councils were held in South Vietnam last May. Observers agree that they were conducted in a fair and orderly manner, and that the candidates substantially reflected local sentiments. Over half the eligible voters were registered and over 70 percent of those registered actually voted. In North Vietnam there can be found, of course, no glimmering of democratic political method.

#### VITAL TO UNITED STATES

The fate of the people of Vietnam is of the same vital concern to the United States as that of those who, in the past, we have helped to resist subjugation. Indeed, the situation in Asia today is reminiscent of the problems the United States confronted in Europe in 1947. The United States faces in Communist China an aggressive nation imbued with the same primitive Communist theology which the Soviet Union had 20 years ago, and possessing (as the Soviet Union did) military resources far greater than those of her neighbors. The area to the south, afflicted by foreign occupation and years of war, offers an invitation to aggression by means of the war of national liberation. Only the United States has the resources to make resistance possible.

The Chinese Communists have made it clear that Vietnam is another test of that strategy in Asia for the aggrandizement of the Communist world. The Communist Chinese Minister of Defense, Marshal Lin Biao, in a speech on September 3, referring to North America and Western Europe as the cities of the world and to Asia, Africa, and Latin America as the rural areas, declared that "contemporary world revolution also presents a picture of the encirclement of cities by the rural areas." In its policy of "encirclement of the cities," southeast Asia has the strategic significance of flanking the Indian subcontinent, facing the Philippines, and straddling the passage from the Pacific to the Indian Ocean.

With appropriate discount for verbal bluster, Communist China has shown an appreciation of the realities of power. There is surely no territory which Communist China desires more ardently than Formosa. Nevertheless, China's recognition of the vast force which the United States can bring to bear in Asia has caused the Communist leadership to refrain from attacking Formosa. The same appreciation of superior might is shown by Chinese unwillingness directly to challenge the United States in southeast Asia.

The American aim in South Vietnam is neither to destroy China nor North Vietnam. It is rather to continue the policy established by President Truman of assisting free nations to resist subjugation until the Communist states become convinced that cheap victories are not possible and that the cost of aggression is too great.

The success of this policy may be seen in the growing moderation which has marked Russian policy in the past 15 years. In time China, too, may grasp the fact that aggression is unrewarding and choose to focus her energies on her vast internal problems while playing a more mature role in the international system.

#### GENERAL WESTMORELAND—TIME'S MAN OF THE YEAR

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, the signal honor of being named Time magazine's "Man of the Year" for 1965 has been conferred on a great American—Gen. William Childs Westmoreland, commander of U.S. forces in Vietnam.

It was a most fitting choice. For General Westmoreland personifies the central crisis of our country in this time of conflict and challenge. He represents the courage and the determination of this Nation to face up to the dangers inherent in the Vietnam war. He is "up front" to help make good the American commitment in the struggle against aggression.

It was most appropriate that Time magazine, in selecting General Westmoreland, focused attention on an outstanding military leader in whom this Nation has entrusted the lives of its fighting men in Vietnam and upon whose shoulders will continue to fall the awesome burden of turning the tide of war in our favor. He has already demonstrated the sterling quality of his military leadership in the often frustrating, agonizing conflict in Vietnam.

The skill and drive with which General Westmoreland built up and directed the American forces have been described in impressive detail in Time's cover story. I commend the article to all patriotic Americans.

The people of Hawaii have a particularly warm association with General

Westmoreland because his family is now in Honolulu. Along with 1,800 other dependents, some of whom are living in Hawaii at present, the Westmoreland family was ordered to leave Vietnam last year when the war spread dangerously.

When her husband was chosen Time's Man of the Year, Mrs. Westmoreland responded with the warmth characteristic of the general himself.

He's not just the man of the year but a representative of the men of the year—the troops in Vietnam—

Mrs. Westmoreland remarked in Honolulu.

When he was here last (Dec. 10-18) he told me he couldn't accept the award except as a symbol of the men in Vietnam. Of course, he's been the man of the year in our family for a long time.

In order that more Americans might become acquainted with the personal background of this stalwart military commander, I ask that General Westmoreland's biography be printed in the RECORD at this point, along with a description of the Man of the Year citation in the January 12, 1966 issue of Army Times.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### WESTMORELAND TIME'S "MAN OF YEAR"

NEW YORK.—Gen. William Childs Westmoreland, MACV commander who "directed the historic buildup, drew up the battle plans, and infused the 190,000 men under him with his own idealistic view of America's aims and responsibilities," has been named Man of the Year for 1965 by the editors of Time magazine.

In selecting for the 39th year the man or woman who "dominated the news of the year and left an indelible mark—for good or ill—on history," Time's editors said:

"General Westmoreland was the sinewy personification of the American Fighting Man in 1965 who, through the monsoon mud of nameless hamlets, amidst the swirling sand of seagirt enclaves, atop the jungled mountains of the Annamese Cordillera, served as the instruments of U.S. policy, quietly enduring the terror and discomfort of a conflict that was not yet a war, on a battlefield that was all no-man's land."

"To the quickening drumfire of the fighting in South Vietnam," Time says, "Americans sensed early in 1965 that they might have to choose between withdrawal or vastly greater involvement in the war. By year's end, it was clear that the United States had irrevocably committed itself to the Nation's third major war in a quarter century, a conflict involving more than 1 million men and the destiny of southeast Asia."

The risk and responsibility for the war, Time says, were President Lyndon Johnson's, who "moved resolutely" to make good his pledge to stand in Vietnam, "weathering open criticism from within his own party, strident protest from the Vietnaml fringe and the disapprobation of friendly nations from the Atlantic to the China Sea. \* \* \*

"It fell to the American fighting man to redeem Johnson's pledge. Plunged abruptly into a punishing environment, pitted against a foe whose murderously effective tactics had been perfected over two decades, the GI faced the strangest, toughest war of all \* \* \* with courage and a cool professionalism that surprised friend and foe, U.S. troops stood fast and firm in South Vietnam. In the waning months of 1965, they helped finally to stem the tide that had run so long with the Reds."

"In the process," Time notes, "American troops gave an incalculable lift to South

January 26, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1131

Vietnam's disheartened people and divided government. And, important as that was, they helped preserve a far greater stake than South Vietnam itself. As the Japanese demonstrated when they seized Indochina at the start of World War II, whoever held the peninsula holds southeast Asia. \* \* \*

"Lyndon Johnson had waited dangerously long to recognize the problem. Thereafter, for all his repeated declarations that the United States would negotiate an honorable settlement 'anywhere, anytime, without any conditions,' despite even last week's multiplicity of peace missions, the President moved swiftly and unstintingly toward its solution. With all the resources available to the world's most powerful nation, Johnson established beyond question the credibility of the U.S. commitment to Asia."

The troops under William Westmoreland did more. "If the other guy can live and fight under these conditions," he said, "so can we." In the baking heat and moldering humidity of the Asian mainland, they rewrote the rules of guerrilla warfare that Communists from Havana to Hanoi had long regarded as holy writ. With stupendous firepower and mobility undreamed of even a decade ago, U.S. strike forces swooped into guerrilla redoubts long considered impenetrable.

"Like clouds of giant dragonflies, helicopters hauled riflemen and heavy artillery from base to battlefield in minutes, given them the advantages of surprise and flexibility. Tactical air strikes scraped guerrillas off jungle ridges or buried them in mazelike tunnels, or kept them forever on the run. Unseen and unheard from the ground, giant B-52's of the Strategic Air Command pattern-bombed the enemy's forest hideaways, leaving no sanctuary inviolable."

Whatever the outcome of the war, Time says, "the most significant consequence of the U.S. buildup is that for the first time in history, the United States in 1965 established bastions across the nerve centers of southeast Asia. From formidable new enclaves in Vietnam to a farflung network of airfields, supply depots, and naval facilities abuilding in Thailand, the United States will soon be able to rush aid to any threatened ally in Asia. \* \* \*

"The U.S. presence will also have a more beneficial impact on the countries involved. The huge ports that are being scooped out at Cam Ranh Bay in Vietnam and at Sattship in Thailand should permanently boost the economies of both nations. Vast U.S.-banked civilian aid programs are aimed at eradicating the ancient ills of disease, illiteracy, and hunger."

Pacification, in the long run, is Westmoreland's greatest challenge. "Vietnam is involved in two simultaneous and very difficult tasks, he says, "nation building and fighting a vicious and well-organized enemy. If it could do either alone the task would be vastly simplified, but it's got to do both at once. A political system is growing. It won't, it can't reach maturity overnight. Helping Vietnam toward the objective may well be the most complex problem ever faced by men in uniform anywhere on earth."

Westmoreland constantly advises his men to remember their proper role in South Vietnam. "Saigon's sovereignty must be honored, protected, and strengthened," he insists. "In 1954 this was a French war. Now it is a Vietnamese war, with us in support. It remains, and will remain, just that."

Time magazine chose its Man of the Year for 1965 from a set of possibilities that ranged all the way from the Beatles to the astronauts, the editors said. The choice will appear on the cover of the January 1 issue of Time.

GEN. WILLIAM CHILDS WESTMORELAND, U.S. ARMY

William Childs Westmoreland was born in Spartanburg County, S.C., March 26, 1914, and graduated from Spartanburg High School in 1931. He attended the Citadel Military College of South Carolina for 1 year, and was then appointed to the U.S. Military Academy, West Point, N.Y. At the U.S. Military Academy he was first captain and regimental commander and was commissioned as a second lieutenant in the field artillery upon graduation on June 12, 1936.

His initial assignment was with a regiment of horse-drawn 75 mm. guns, the 18th Field Artillery, at Fort Sill, Okla. In March 1939, he joined the 8th Field Artillery of the Hawaiian Division at Schofield Barracks, Hawaii. Here he served as a battery officer, battalion staff officer, and battery commander. In May 1941, as a captain, he was assigned to the just organized 9th Infantry Division at Fort Bragg, N.C., as operations officer of the 34th Field Artillery Battalion (155 mm. Howitzer).

In April 1942 he assumed command of the 34th Field Artillery Battalion and moved with it later that year to Morocco, North Africa. He commanded the battalion in combat in Tunisia and Sicily. During combat in Tunisia, his battalion was awarded the Presidential Unit Citation.

During the campaign in Sicily, General Westmoreland's battalion was successively attached to the 82d Airborne Division, and the 1st Infantry Division before returning to its parent division. In March 1944 he was named executive officer of the 9th Infantry Division Artillery while the division was staging in southern England preparatory to the invasion of the Continent. Following D-Day, he fought with the 9th Infantry Division through France, Belgium, and into Germany. In October 1944 he was named chief of staff of the division, serving in that capacity in continuous combat from the German border to the Elbe River.

In June 1945 General Westmoreland assumed command of the 60th Infantry Regiment in Germany and in January 1946 was transferred to the 71st Infantry Division and as commander of that division returned it to the United States for inactivation.

Following training at Fort Benning, Ga., he earned the Parachute and Glider Badges and assumed command of the 504th Parachute Infantry of the 82d Airborne Division at Fort Bragg, N.C., in July 1946. In August 1947 he was named chief of staff of the 82d Airborne Division, serving in that capacity for the next 3 years.

He was appointed an instructor at the Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., in August 1950. Later that year he was designated an instructor at the newly organized Army War College, also at Fort Leavenworth, and in June 1951 moved to Carlisle Barracks, Pa., with the Army War College, serving as a member of the faculty until July 1952.

On August 1, 1952, he assumed command of the 187th Airborne Regimental Combat Team in Korea. While under his command, the unit was twice committed to combat and during the interim was deployed to Japan as theater reserve. The Republic of Korea awarded his unit the Distinguished Unit Citation. During this period he was promoted to brigadier general at the age of 38. In August 1953 he was awarded the Master Parachute Badge.

In November 1953 he reported for duty as Deputy Assistant Chief of Staff, G1, for Manpower Control. In 1954 he attended the advanced management program of the Harvard Business School in Boston, Mass. He was named to the Secretary of the Army General Staff in July 1955.

On December 1, 1957, the Chief of Staff of the Army, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, pinned a second star on General Westmoreland, making him at that time, the youngest major general in the Army.

General Westmoreland assumed command of the 101st Airborne Division "Screaming Eagles" at Fort Campbell, on April 2, 1958.

In July 1960, General Westmoreland was appointed Superintendent of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. He was transferred to Fort Bragg, N.C., in July 1963, at which time he became commanding general, STRAC and XVIII Airborne Corps.

In January 1964, he reported to duty at the U.S. Military Assistance Command, Vietnam. He was assigned first as deputy commander, then acting commander and finally, in August 1964 was made commander, U.S. Military Assistance Command, Vietnam.

### FLOOD CONTROL SURVEY AT AUSTIN, MINN.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, 1965 will long be remembered in my State of Minnesota as a year unparalleled for devastation wrought by natural disasters. Tornadoes and unprecedented spring flooding combined to build a loss measured by scores of lives and millions of dollars.

For many natural disasters little adequate preventive action can be taken. But that is not the case with flooding.

One Minnesota city particularly plagued by recurrent flooding is Austin, a community of nearly 28,000 people built on the banks of the Cedar River. On March 1, 1965, following an unexpectedly rapid thaw of heavy snow covering, serious flooding of the Red Cedar River occurred. That flooding, in turn, resulted in serious and extensive damage to both residential and commercial property.

Recognizing the strong likelihood of recurrent flooding owing to the inadequate nature of flood control facilities in Austin and its environs, the city council of that city requested that surveys be undertaken at once to assess the need for flood control improvements.

I am happy to report that the Army Corps of Engineers has announced the initiation of such survey studies for the entire Iowa-Cedar River Basin. It is clear that this is necessary and desirable.

Our cities and towns must be made secure from the ravages of wind and water to the fullest extent possible. It is an all too sad fact that much of the multimillion-dollar damage wrought in Minnesota during 1965 could have been avoided or substantially alleviated had preventive flood control measures been undertaken years ago.

I welcome this announcement by the corps, and I commend the citizens and leaders of Austin whose perseverance is responsible for the initiation of this survey.

### LIFE AND COMMUNITY SERVICE IN RURAL AMERICA

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, Staff Writer Bernard Kelly of the Denver Post Sunday magazine, Empire, has presented a telling picture of life and com-



munity service in rural America. His article, which appeared this past Sunday, details how the Little Bear Grange set about improving community life for families in its area of northern Laramie County and southern Platte County, Wyo. For its efforts, Little Bear Grange No. 73 was awarded the \$3,000 prize offered by the National Grange and the Sears, Roebuck Foundation. Their efforts, encouraged by the Grange, are an example to all, Mr. President, not just to ranchers or farmers in rural America. For it is this type of self-help which can do much to beautify America and make it a better place to live.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Kelly's article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**BIG DOINGS AT LITTLE BEAR—RANCH FOLK OF SOUTHEASTERN WYOMING COMBINED SOCIAL WORK WITH FUN AND WON A PRIZE OF \$3,000 FOR THEIR GRANGE**

(By Bernard Kelly)

Last March 2, Ray Darby and Ross Welty, Wyoming ranchers, drove to a mill at a place called Foxpark, where lumber could be bought inexpensively. The temperature was 45 degrees below zero. They bought the lumber they needed, loaded it in two pickup trucks, and took it back to a snowswept plot of ground just off U.S. 87 between Cheyenne and Chugwater, Wyo. It had been a 287-mile round trip.

This volunteer mission in searing cold was undertaken on behalf of Little Bear Grange No. 73, a fraternal organization close to the hearts of its members who live in this lonely land.

As a result of the sacrifice of these two men, and hundreds of other selfless actions by its members, Little Bear Grange in 1965 won \$3,000 in prize money for community-betterment programs. It now meets in its own newly remodeled home—partly finished with Foxpark lumber.

Welty, master of Little Bear Grange, says every cent of the \$3,000 will go into further community betterment.

Most city folks, caught up in a tight and tense round of work and social activity, never have heard of the grange. And, if they have, they probably haven't much idea of what it is.

But, for the people of Little Bear community and 6,000 other communities in 38 States, the grange is a center of service and social life—a place to meet friends, to eat community suppers, to laugh and sing, to plan and to work. Whole families belong to the grange, and every night of the week, Monday through Friday, 500 grange meetings are held in grange halls from Maine to Florida to Kansas to Washington. There are two grange halls inside the city of Denver. They were there first and the city grew around them. And there are granges like Little Bear where in some places the sky and the earth are the only neighbors in sight.

The National Grange—officially the Order of the Patrons of Husbandry—is a farmers' organization. It is a fraternal order, with a secret ritual, degrees, and a program of recreation and education for members.

Its ranks are open to men, women, and children, and thus the close ties of farm and ranch families are carried over into Grange work.

Many local or subordinate Granges, like Little Bear, own their own halls, which serve as meeting places for themselves, other organizations, and the communities at large.

The 2-year program in which Little Bear Grange won the \$3,000 was sponsored by the

National Grange and the Sears-Roebuck Foundation. The competition began October 1, 1963, and closed August 1, 1965.

The idea was for the individual granges to study local needs, start programs to fill these needs, and carry them through. The work was then reported to judges, who later made inspections in person. First prize was \$10,000, second \$5,000, and third \$3,000.

More than 4,500 local granges with a membership of more than 400,000 persons participated, and there were projects in all 38 granger States. Reports indicated more than 10 million man hours were devoted to projects.

Little Bear Grange draws members from a sparsely settled area of 736 square miles. Ten of its members live in Cheyenne, and two in Chugwater, 47 miles north of Cheyenne on U.S. 87. Most, however, live east and west of U.S. 87 at distances of 1 to 13 miles from the highway and from 1 to 22 miles from the Grange hall.

This hall is 31 miles north of Cheyenne and 16 miles south of Chugwater. There's a sign pointing the way to it, but you can't see the hall from the highway. And you have to take down (and put back up) a gate in the barbed wire fence to drive to the Grange hall.

Members of Little Bear Grange took a look around their community and settled on a number of projects. Some, which were largely instrumental in winning the prize, were—

Developing a new grange hall and community center.

Installing rural road direction signs.

Conducting a community beautification program, including planting programs at a local cemetery and park.

A roadside cleanup program.

"We got the entire community interested," says Welty, "and a lot of folks helped. Other organizations pitched in and helped, too."

Until about a year and a half ago Little Bear Grange had met in a building on U.S. 87 named Richard Hall. When the building was sold and turned into a nightclub with bar, it left the community without a place to hold meetings.

A committee drove around the countryside looking at buildings. They found one, 16 by 42 feet in size, which had been two schoolhouses joined together. It had been standing for years on a field owned by Richard DuVall, a resident of the community, and was in poor condition.

The grange bought the building for \$250. Members and friends donated time and work, trucks and gas, and lumber, doors and furniture. For \$1 DuVall gave the grange a long-term lease on the ground where the building stood.

Francis Gard, chairman of the building committee, discovered he could buy lumber at good prices at Foxpark—good enough to make the 287-mile round trip worthwhile.

The building was remodeled and an addition built on the north side. While the men sawed and hammered, the women swept, picked up, scrubbed, cleaned and helped with the painting.

The hall, though not yet finished, was dedicated July 18, 1965, with the State Master, Morris Korshner, as dedicating officer. Five other Wyoming granges—Iowa Center, Antelope Gap, Cottonwood, Burns, and Platte County Pomona—were represented. Many nongrangers attended.

"We feel we're off to a good start," says Welty. "The main hall takes care of the grange meetings, and we have a kitchen, and a dining room which is used by the junior grange for their work. We have a stage and piano for entertainment, and a small room for miscellaneous use in back."

"We feel this hall will serve Little Bear Grange for any occasion, and it's available for other civic and local organizations, too."

Some finishing work remains to be done,

and a lot of improvements are planned. But Little Bear Grange has a new home.

In their report the grangers estimated 40 persons helped in the work. They traveled 6,222 miles and spent 1,756 hours on the project.

Anyone who has traveled much on back country roads knows how much a good road sign system is needed. Several years ago Little Bear Grange put up direction signs from the main highway to each farm and ranch in the community. During the following years the signs were destroyed, defaced, or became out of date.

The grange decided to fix the signs. Old ones were taken down and repaired or replaced. New ones were added. In all, 70 signs were installed. The cost to the people—nothing.

Yard beautification has been a continuing project.

"There is scarcely a yard in the community now that is not fenced and improved," reports the grange. "This project has even made people outside our community conscious of their yards. A grange member gave away 300 tulip bulbs to residents of the community and others helped in the same way with small plants and shrubs. We follow this way of increasing our plantings by giving to each other. We know people are happier and more contented with beautiful surroundings."

The community cemetery is on a hilltop far from main roads. It commands a view of the rolling prairie country that is starkly impressive. The Grange planted more than 200 tulip bulbs as markers. Members cut and pulled weeds, raked and hauled away rubbish.

Some of the Grangers' work was less important, but just the same it was full of selfless spirit—and has a folksy sound that has largely been lost in urban affairs.

The following passages are made from the prize-winning report of Little Bear Grange, quoted by permission of its master, Ross Welty. Although not intended for publication they have a flavor of community life:

"Francis Gard mowed several miles of weeds and grass on the old highway and county road. This made it safer by eliminating the danger of hidden animals, such as a deer, bounding out in front of a car."

"Dick DuVall, a member, sheared 11 head of sheep for a little 4-H girl. Her father brought the sheep about 30 miles to Dick's house for him to shear. He didn't charge her anything."

"Dick and Emma DuVall were on their way to cut oats and saw that a neighbor's windmill had fallen down and the cows were almost out of water. They drove down to tell them about it."

Aid to the distressed is never forgotten:

"A small child was hit by a car and had serious head injuries. The father was out of work and they needed food. An alert Granger \* \* \* began calling everyone she knew in her vicinity. Before the day was over she had food lined up for a week's meals. She collected the food shortly before each meal time and took it to the home."

"CHORES, CARE, FOOD, AND FUN"

"When the Ross Welty's had a death in their family this spring, Ray Derby did their chores for 2 days and looked after things so they could go back to Nebraska for the funeral."

"One of our members had the misfortune to lose an arm. The first few days he was in the hospital with terrible pain some of the neighbors and his relatives took turns sitting in his hospital room with him to help save nurse care. This was done by five people day and night for 5 days."

"Rose and Ida Welty gave 6 hens and 30 cans of food to the Salvation Army \* \* \*. Francis and Hilda Gard gave 18 chickens to the Salvation Army \* \* \*. Emma and

January 26, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1133

Dick DuVall gave 97 articles of clothing to the Goodwill Industries."

There was fun along with the work.

"A year ago a Grange family, the Jay Blasses, decided to sell out and move to North Carolina, so the Grange gave them a party and supper at the hall. During the supper we took up a collection of over \$30 and since the husband always wanted a set of 'Texas longhorns' this is what they bought with the money.

"A continued project is the Christmas party we give for the children of the community each year with the help of the ladies club. We always ask each child that comes to take part in the program. The ladies have a grand time making popcorn balls, sacking candy, and having fun. Each child is given a gift and treats are given to young and old alike."

Perhaps the most unusual project was this. A piano was donated to the Grange, "a good upright, but a little old fashioned and quite out of tune.

"One of our new Grange members, Ben Shain, is a piano technician. He took the piano to his shop and completely restyled and rebuilt it. He also put on a new finish and tuned it.

"He drove 66 miles to pick up and deliver the piano. A job like this usually runs about \$150. Shain's fee to the Grange was 1 year's dues paid for himself and his wife (about \$14)."

The National Grange was founded in 1867 in Washington, D.C., by Oliver Hudson Kelley, a Government clerk. Kelley had been on a tour of the South and had found the farmers poor and discouraged. He decided they ought to be bound together for mutual benefit in a fraternal organization. This organization, Kelley decided, should give the members a chance to learn modern methods of farming.

In 1868 he organized the first local bodies, and called them Granges. By 1875 the Grange had 850,000 members and 21,000 Granges. It lost membership in the 1880's but began to grow again in the 1890's. By 1947 it was said to own halls and equipment valued at \$35 million. Colorado has 122 Granges.

As it now exists the organization has a Junior Grange for children 4 to 14. At 15 they are eligible for the subordinate Grange, which has four degrees, the ritual of which is based on the four seasons. A district Grange, called a Pomona, is the fifth degree, the State Grange is the sixth, and the national the seventh degree. Little Bear Grange has 61 members in 25 families. Anyone acceptable to other members of the Grange can join—except a saloonkeeper.

What's coming up in 1966 for Little Bear Grange?

Now that they have \$3,000 in prize money to work with, they plan to buy the land on which the Grange hall stands. They'll put down a well for water and pipe the water into the hall, then install rest rooms. There's talk of expanding the main hall another 6 to 8 feet.

And there's another 2-year competition coming up. There's nothing in the rules to keep Little Bear Grange from winning again.

#### PROPOSED DISCONTINUANCE OF PASSENGER SERVICE ON THE NEW YORK, NEW HAVEN & HARTFORD RAILROAD—RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE VILLAGE OF PELHAM MANOR

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the board of trustees of the Village of Pelham Manor protesting the proposed dis-

continuance of passenger service on the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION REGARDING APPLICATION OF NEW YORK, NEW HAVEN & HARTFORD RAILROAD CO., TRUSTEES, TO INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION TO DISCONTINUE ALL INTERSTATE PASSENGER TRAINS—INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION FINANCE DOCKET NO. 23831

"Whereas there is now pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission an application by the Trustees of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co. to discontinue all interstate passenger trains, being finance docket No. 23831, and

"Whereas the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad is the only direct means of public transportation between the Village of Pelham Manor and Grand Central Terminal in New York City and between the Village of Pelham Manor and other Westchester County communities and communities located on the said railroad right-of-way in the State of Connecticut, and

"Whereas the Village of Pelham Manor is a first class village of over 5,000 residents and a great number of its residents use said railroad daily for the purpose of transportation from Pelham Manor to their respective places of business in New York City, and

"Whereas many residents of the Village of Pelham Manor purchased homes in Pelham Manor relying on the public transportation furnished by the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., and

"Whereas the discontinuance of the passenger service would have an adverse effect on real property values in the Village of Pelham Manor, due to the fact that many of the residents who use the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad would be forced to vacate their residences, and

"Whereas the discontinuance of passenger service would increase the vehicular traffic in the already overcrowded traffic in the city of New York, and

"Whereas the merchants and small business people who conduct their business in the Village of Pelham Manor rely upon the families of commuting residents, not only of Pelham Manor but of the neighboring Villages of Pelham and North Pelham for their livelihood, and

"Whereas the public convenience and necessity requires the continuance of the passenger service: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That this board opposes the application of the trustees of said railroad to discontinue passenger service and requests permission to intervene and send its representatives to hearings on this matter before the Interstate Commerce Commission, and be it further

*Resolved*, That the mayor of this village is hereby authorized to appear and testify in said hearings being conducted by the Interstate Commerce Commission on behalf of this board and the residents of this village and to take all steps necessary and do all things which he believes to be necessary or expedient on our and their behalf to avoid the discontinuance of passenger service over the right-of-way of said railroad, and to co-operate with other municipalities that are or will be affected by a discontinuance of passenger service and with the interested governmental departments or agencies of the State of New York, the county of Westchester, the State of Connecticut, and its affected municipalities, and it is further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Interstate Commerce Commission at its office in Washington, D.C., to Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, to our representatives in the New York State Legislature to Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Senator ROBERT F.

KENNEDY, and to Congressman OGDEN R. REID, Office of Transportation of the State of New York, Westchester County Executive Edwin G. Michaelian, County Attorney Gordon Miller, and the mayors of the cities of New Rochelle, Mount Vernon and Rye, and the villages of Pelham, North Pelham, Larchmont, Mamaroneck, Harrison and Portchester, and the supervisors of the town of Pelham and the town of Mamaroneck."

STATE OF NEW YORK,  
County of Westchester, ss.:

I, the undersigned, village clerk of the Village of Pelham Manor, do hereby certify that I have compared the foregoing resolution with the original thereof, on file in my office, and that the same is a true, full, and complete copy of a resolution duly adopted at a regular meeting of the board of trustees of the Village of Pelham Manor, duly called and held on the 10th day of January, 1966, at which meeting all of the members of said board were present and voted in the affirmative and of the whole thereof.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed the corporate seal of the Village of Pelham Manor, this 12th day of January, 1966.

[SEAL] JULIUS J. ZHWORSCHAK,  
Village Clerk.

#### PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the community development program presented by the President today is designed to correct the serious and persistent lag in opportunity for people in rural areas.

Rural people as a whole are not sharing fully in our expanding economy.

Rural median income in 1960 was \$4,381. Urban median income was \$6,166.

There were only 50 doctors per 100,000 population in rural areas in 1965 compared with 133 per 100,000 population in metropolitan areas.

The average rural adult has about 2 years less time in school than the average urban adult.

Despite these statistics, only about 18 percent of the trainees in the manpower development and training programs have originated from rural areas, and only 3.4 percent of the training classes have been conducted in cities of 10,000 population or less. In addition, only 15.8 percent of the funds advanced under the economic opportunity program for community action programs have gone to rural areas.

A new and concerted effort will be needed to overcome these disadvantages of rural people and I certainly support it. The President's proposals will lay a useful foundation for efficient development of the great potentials that exist in rural communities—both in terms of human and natural resources.

#### FORMULA FOR LIQUIDATING A MISTAKE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, Walter Lippmann has, through the decades, acquired the reputation as the wisest of our public commentators. In recent months he has been conspicuous for the sanity and soundness of his views on the U.S. military involvement in Vietnam and southeast Asia.

His column which appeared in this morning's Washington Post, entitled "Well, What Can He Do?" is illustrative of the enlightened character of his comments.

I ask unanimous consent that this column be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 25, 1966]

TODAY AND TOMORROW: WELL, WHAT CAN HE DO?

(By Walter Lippmann)

The reason why the peace offensive failed is most cogently revealed in the Mansfield report on the state of the war. Mr. Johnson has been trying to obtain by propaganda the victory which he has not been able to obtain on the battlefield—that is to say, the acceptance in the whole of South Vietnam of a government which has lost control of a very large part of South Vietnam. The peace offensive was bound to fail, and the grave decisions which the President hoped to circumvent and avoid are now before him.

If he is to make these decisions wisely, he must recognize that in international politics peace settlements are possible only as and when they reflect the real balance of power. In the World War, for example, Churchill and Roosevelt had to settle with Stalin for a Soviet political frontier in the midst of Germany and of Europe. That is where the Red army had arrived when the peace negotiations began. The same principle will hold in Vietnam. There will be no settlement until the terms of peace reflect the military reality.

The President will be disappointed again and again as long as he and Secretary Rusk ask for a settlement which in effect demands that the defeat of the Saigon forces be transmuted at the conference table into a victory for the Saigon forces. Nor should he indulge in any illusion that the informed opinion of mankind really thinks as Secretary Rusk talks merely because American envoys have been politely and sympathetically received in so many capitals.

What then should the President do? It is often said by the President's supporters that his critics propose no alternative to what he is doing. If that was ever true, it is no longer true today. It is not true since the Mansfield report and since the Gavin statement. The President should reduce his war aims, which today are impossibly high in the light of the conditions described in the Mansfield report. He should alter his strategy along the lines proposed by General Gavin, making it a holding operation pending the eventual negotiation of a political settlement.

The Mansfield report shows that Mr. Rusk's objective—the rule of General Ky or his successor over the whole of South Vietnam—is unattainable no matter how much the war is escalated. The burden of disproving the conclusions of the Mansfield report is on those who have been proved wrong about the escalation of last summer, on those who are now asking for another escalation in order to redeem their failure, on those who want to redouble the stakes in order to recoup their losses.

If the Mansfield report contains the truth of the matter, it follows inevitably that our war aims should be reduced and our strategy revised. We should put aside the hopeless task of searching out and destroying the Vietcong, and we should take our stand, as General Gavin advises, on a holding operation in the coastal cities.

This is not a policy for a glorious victory or for some kind of dazzling political triumph. It is no trick for pulling rabbits

out of a hat. It is a formula for liquidating a mistake, for ending a war that cannot be won at any tolerable price, for cutting our losses before they escalate into bankruptcy, and for listening to commonsense rather than to war whoops and tomtoms.

Because we are neither omniscient nor omnipotent, we, even we Americans, cannot always win. But I cannot help feeling in my bones that a display of commonsense by a proud and imperious nation would be a good moral investment for the future.

#### SENATOR MCCARTHY'S RESOLUTION ON THE CIA

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on Monday Senator MCCARTHY offered a Senate resolution (S. Res. 210) providing for "a full and complete study with respect to the effects of the operations and activities of the Central Intelligence Agency upon the foreign relations of the United States." Under the resolution, this task would be undertaken by the Foreign Relations Committee or an authorized subcommittee, and report would be made by January 31, 1966.

On Sunday the Washington Post presented an editorial commenting on the McCarthy proposal and his intention to offer the resolution. The editorial lifts up and comments on the point that the CIA has attained very great importance "as a factor in the formulation and execution of foreign policy."

As the editorial notes, the question whose study is called for does not deal with the more controversial question of whether or not the CIA should be involved in formulating or carrying out foreign policy, but with "the effects of its operations" on our foreign relations.

This is a proper sphere for concern of the Foreign Relations Committee. The area marked out by the resolution is not in conflict with that which is presently under jurisdiction of Armed Services and Appropriations Subcommittees. This, too, the Washington Post editorial points out.

I ask unanimous consent Mr. President, that the item to which I have referred may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 23, 1966]

#### CONGRESS AND CIA

Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY has announced that he intends to seek Senate authorization for an investigation of the impact of the CIA on U.S. foreign policy. The mechanism for this would be a new subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the CIA or—should the Senate prefer—a broader select committee. This is not the first attempt to bring the CIA under congressional surveillance. At the time of his death, the late Brian McMahon had indicated his intention to work for a Joint Congressional Committee on Central Intelligence as a followup to his successful fight to establish the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Majority Leader MANSFIELD and his 34 cosponsors envisaged just such a joint committee in their ill-fated 1956 resolution; and Senator MCCARTHY himself has kept the issue alive since. But the present move is unprecedented in its sharp focus on the importance of the CIA as a factor in the formulation and execution of foreign policy.

There can be little doubt that the institutionalized growth of the intelligence arm of our Government during the cold war years has impinged to a very great extent on what has traditionally been the exclusive sphere of the State Department. The CIA's experts in Saigon or Santo Domingo assess many of the same matters that preoccupy embassy political officers, and its operatives necessarily stir up dark waters that a diplomat might prefer to leave undisturbed. While on paper the CIA answers to the Ambassador in a foreign capital, in case after case the tail has wagged the dog. President Kennedy's Executive order of May 1961, reaffirming the authority of the Ambassador, has had relatively little practical meaning.

Senator MCCARTHY does not enter directly into the controversy over whether or not the new power of the CIA is a desirable and indeed unavoidable response to a new kind of global political contest. His concern appears to be primarily that this power be made subject to congressional restraints—and that the committees of Congress dealing with foreign policy have a central place in overseeing the CIA.

The establishment of the proposed subcommittee would be a desirable first step indicating a recognition by Congress that the Foreign Relations Committee has a proper interest in the affairs of the CIA. Both the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees have long had subcommittees on the CIA, and these bodies now hold informal joint meetings with CIA officials at irregular intervals in which the Foreign Relations Committee should be given a voice. Beyond this, the work of the new subcommittee in examining the record of the CIA could be a valuable guide for future congressional action, though it should be self-evident that this examination would have to be conducted under ground rules not normally acceptable to Congress.

#### REPORT ON SOUTH AMERICA—TRIBUTE TO JACK HOOD VAUGHN

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, last November, during the interim, the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] and I made an extensive tour of South America. We visited four countries—Peru, Argentina, Brazil, and Chile—and in each one we sought information on the economy, the people, and the government. Also, we sought to check on the effectiveness of our programs involving Latin America, seeking guidance on matters which will be coming before the Senate.

Among the highlights of our 3-week trip, as far as I am concerned, were our visits with the Peace Corps volunteers and the opportunity to watch them working among the people of Latin America in the fields and villages and in the crowded slum sections of some of the cities. I was deeply impressed by the dedication, the intelligence, and the ability of these Americans who are serving the cause of humanity in faraway places. The Peace Corps volunteers, I discovered, are in close contact with the people, are trusted and respected, and have a real feeling of the conditions in the countries where they serve.

Before making the South American trip, I was briefed by Jack Hood Vaughn, who then served as Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs and U.S. Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress. Mr. Vaughn is a talented and dedicated administrator, and the insight I gained from our visit was most helpful.



January 26, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1155

est non-Russian independent nation in Eastern Europe, became the victim of the same techniques practiced by the Communist tyranny that are today observed in Vietnam.

Vietnam is our primary concern today. The freedom and independence of the Vietnamese is our immediate goal today. But let us not believe that freedom for any of the captive nations is beyond our reach. And let our actions be such that the way to freedom is not made more difficult because the Communist position through our actions or policies is strengthened.

So it is well that we commemorate the 48th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine. It tells the peoples of the captive nations that they have not been forsaken. It tells them that America is, and forever will be, with them.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUDGET— PLAYGROUNDS AND RECREATION AREAS

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, in beginning my study of the budget for the District of Columbia which we just received from the President, I have already noted one point which I think is sufficiently important to call to the attention of the Senate. I refer to the proposals to give financial support to improving the availability and quality of some of our existing parks and recreation areas.

We all know that there are parts of the District where more playgrounds are badly needed. But the fact is that the problem is aggravated because existing facilities in these areas are not being properly utilized. Padlocks go on the gates of school playgrounds and even Recreation Department facilities sometimes as early as the end of the school day—at 3 or 4 in the afternoon. It is a fact that in many cases playgrounds are least available when they are needed the most.

I shall, of course, support all efforts by the Recreation Department to expand its facilities, but in the meantime, I hope that we will provide the Department with the funds to keep its present facilities open for as many hours a day, and for as many days a week, as they are needed.

I am delighted, therefore, to see this item in the budget for the District.

#### U THANT ON VIETNAM

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the Washington Star, in its January 24 issue, took a critical look at the utterances of U.N. General Secretary U Thant who, in his recent press conference, could find little to praise in the American position in Vietnam, nor little to criticize in the position of our adversaries.

The Evening Star was overly kind in terming Mr. Thant's remarks "compulsive self-delusion." Indeed, the Burmese schoolteacher's views on the Vietnam conflict would seem to prove that a stupid statement by a statesman of stature often assumes the stature of the statesman when, in fact, the statesman should assume the stature of the state-

The Evening Star observed, in pointing out that the coalition government of Laos has fallen into disrepute, that—

In Vietnam there is no possibility whatever of forming a successful coalition between factions which have been engaged in bitter warfare for the better part of 20 years.

Mr. President, I ask that the editorial of the Evening Star be printed in the body of the Record with my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 24, 1966]

#### U THANT ON VIETNAM

As Secretary General of the United Nations, U Thant has an unquestioned obligation to align himself with those who seek a peaceful settlement of the war in Vietnam. He has no obligation, however, to indulge in such exercises of compulsive self-delusion as his most recent press conference.

His suggestions for new concessions designed to overcome Communist aversion to truce talks reveal an interesting fact about the peace lobby of which he is a prominent member. When it comes to Vietnam, the doves are very much like the most ardent hawks: Concession to their arguments only brings on an immediate demand for more and bigger concessions. The pressures for total war on the one hand and total surrender on the other represent equally serious problems for American policymakers.

Since the pause in the bombing of North Vietnam has produced no response from the Communist side, U Thant apparently now wants the pause to be extended indefinitely. While Hanoi and Peking remain as belligerent as ever, he suggests that the "psychological climate" should be improved "by all measures possible"—which means simply by new conciliatory gestures from the United States.

Among these is the idea that peace talks should be held directly with members of the Vietcong's National Liberation Front and that it should be agreed ahead of time that members of this organization be accepted as members of a new Saigon Government. Such an offer, in U Thant's opinion, would make it "difficult to justify" a Communist refusal to negotiate.

The fact that such an offer also would make it enormously difficult to negotiate anything other than a complete sellout of South Vietnam to the Communists apparently does not enter into the Secretary General's calculations. For their part, the Vietcong always have made it perfectly clear that they are interested in nothing less than the complete domination of the country. In Laos, where a three-way Communist, neutralist, and rightwing coalition was attempted in 1962, the Communists pulled out and returned to guerrilla tactics as soon as they failed to win outright control. In Vietnam, there is no possibility whatever of forming a successful coalition between factions which have been engaged in bitter warfare for the better part of 20 years.

In the case of Vietnam, U Thant is firmly wedded to the notion that bigger and better concessions are called for. In the case of China, which he argues will "naturally" have to be associated with any peace settlement in Vietnam, there is the implication that if only everyone would stop treating the country as "an outcast, outlaw and culprit," China might stop acting like one.

It all makes an agreeable pipedream. U Thant is not the first person to believe that ambitious and belligerent nations can be appeased into becoming more congenial members of the world community. And na-

tions which have followed this course have learned many times to their sorrow what the price of illusion can be.

#### BOMBING PAUSE SHOULD CONTINUE FOR PRESENT IN VIETNAM CONFLICT

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I will support the principle of fund requests for support of the war against aggression in Vietnam, but with some reservations pending further developments.

Fundamentally I am for an honorable peace—but it must be a secure peace—and we must continually strive to achieve it. Until the peace is assured, however, and as long as we must persist in Vietnam with our South Vietnamese and other allies to thwart Communist aggression and infiltration, I will support the policy that the Vietnam effort and our manpower commitment to that effort must have the top priority attention of the Government and its citizens.

In answer to questions as to whether or not bombing of North Vietnam should be resumed and as to whether or not there should be assaults from the air on military and industrial targets in the Hanoi urban complex and of the North Vietnam port of Haiphong, I assert:

It is my judgment that we must first acknowledge that the conflict in Vietnam is one which, in one form or another, has been going on almost continuously for approximately 20 years, even though United States direct involvement has been relatively recent. Therefore, it is hardly surprising that a peace offensive on our part, no matter how sincere or intensive, would fail to yield definitive results in a short period of time. I hope that our efforts to achieve a basis for negotiations will continue. And, as a part of these efforts, I trust that we will continue to refrain from bombing North Vietnam unless there is a clear indication that such a policy unnecessarily jeopardizes American and allied forces in South Vietnam.

With reference to whether or not there should be bombing of military and industrial targets in the Hanoi urban complex and of the port of Haiphong, I note that the President's top advisers seem to be divided in degree in their views of the value of such bombing. And I point out that the Mansfield mission of Senators declared in the report filed January 3, 1966, with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and made public to the Nation, that Hanoi and Saigon are "mutual hostages, one for the other." This is a sobering evaluation and bears equally on the relationship of the port of Haiphong and the main port facilities we use in South Vietnam. Therefore, I oppose the bombing of Hanoi's urban complex and the port of Haiphong at this time.

#### RETIREMENT OF WALTER REYNOLDS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on December 31, Walter Reynolds retired after 37 years on Capitol Hill. I have had the good fortune to know and work

with Walter Reynolds for much of that time.

In his long career of public service, Walter Reynolds has demonstrated fairness in judgment, steadiness of administration, reliability in handling difficult and delicate tasks of investigation and legislation, and unusual skill in working with Senators and Staff.

Those of us serving as members of the Government Operations Committee are particularly going to miss Walter Reynolds. He has been our able adviser and stalwart collaborator in his capacity as chief clerk and staff director. He has served the committee, the Congress, and the country well.

I want to wish both Walter and Clare good fortune and good health as they leave official duty and start their well-earned retirement.

#### INDIA'S NATIONAL HOLIDAY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, today, 17 years after achieving independence, India celebrates her national holiday. It is only proper that we take note of this great nation.

During December of last year, it was a pleasure and an education for me, along with several of my colleagues of the Senate, to be a guest of the Indian Parliament on the great subcontinent. There, we had fruitful exchanges with a variety of public officials, and we observed many facets of Indian life from marketplaces to modern farms.

A nation twice the size of the American population, located on a land area one-third that of the United States, India has faced enormous economic problems which our nation was fortunate to escape during its formative years. With determined effort India has nevertheless raised the gross national product by 43 percent in the decade after 1954. Under her present 5-year plan, she is pressing forward for balanced development of power facilities, industry, agriculture, mining, transportation, and communications.

Through a federal structure similar to our own, through a national parliamentary system, and through revitalization of traditional village councils where "grass roots democracy" is fostered, India seeks to bind together a people diverse in language, ethnic origin, and religious belief.

Recently, the American people have been particularly aware of the agricultural needs of the rapidly expanding Indian population. Our nation has enjoyed a surplus in this vital area, and we only hope that an adequate distributive system will be developed to assure linkage between American supply and Indian demand for foodstuffs. It is the wish of many, I know, that our governments continue to build such arrangements.

Taxed by a host of domestic exigencies, Indian leadership has demonstrated remarkable energy and determination in strengthening democratic institutions, building an integrated economy, and stimulating social reforms.

With independence, India immediately rose to a position of prestige and

leadership within the international community. Her vigorous activities in the United Nations, her willingness to both lead and serve, her earnest desire for international cooperation, have often been an example to us all. In less than two decades, she has made a distinct contribution—often a voice of reason amidst the thunder of cold war propaganda.

Today much promise is seen in the new Prime Minister who will doubtless carry forward the Indian tradition of excellence in leadership. Having made with her nation the long trek to independence, having served it faithfully at the side of her father and in several official capacities, Prime Minister Indira Gandhi possesses the requisite wisdom and courage. She fills us with great expectation.

Mr. President, it is my wish that our two nations will continue to grow in friendship and mutual respect, and I know that many join with me in saluting the Indian people on this occasion.

#### THE AMERICAN SUCCESS STORY AWARDS—TRIBUTE TO TALBOT T. SPEER

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, recently the 1965 American Success Story Awards, made annually by the Free Enterprise Awards Association, were awarded to 10 outstanding American citizens.

The awards chairman is himself one of the foremost examples of the American success story and a leading Maryland citizen. He is Mr. Talbot T. Speer, who has risen from salesman to owner of one of the oldest and most respected newspapers in America, the 238-year-old Maryland Gazette, in addition to numerous other enterprises.

Since Mr. Speer's rise to success serves as an inspiring model for young Americans, I would like to have inserted in the Record a recent tribute to Mr. Speer by Mr. Charles P. Crane, another outstanding Maryland citizen.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this tribute be reprinted in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Maryland Gazette]

#### AWARDS CHAIRMAN SPEER SYMBOLIZES TRAITS OF AWARDEES

Of the many words of praise written about FEAA Awards Chairman Talbot T. Speer, none more succinctly summarized his character, fighting spirit and service to his community than those of Charles P. Crane, former president and chairman of the Baltimore Gas & Electric Co., who now is the firm's executive committee chairman.

Said Crane, in introducing Speer as he was to be honored by the Newcomen Society in North America:

"He has carried energy and determination with him through his business career. His drive and will to succeed have never diminished. A man of action, he often has stepped into difficult and patriotic chores because of his belief in the cause they represented. And I'm happy to say, he has been instrumental in leading them to successful goals."

Speer has, indeed, been a fighter all of his life.

Following great athletic achievements at the University of Maryland and the University of Virginia in football and track, he became an officer of the famous U.S. Army's 1st Division which so highly distinguished itself in France.

His leadership and courage with field artillery won for him one of the few Silver Stars that were awarded for heroism.

Captain Speer also returned to the United States at the close of the war wearing, in addition to the U.S. Silver Star Medal, the French Fourragere, Croix de Guerre Medal, and the right to wear the Purple Heart Ribbon.

At stages throughout his more recent life, the Government has continued to cite Speer for his service on commissions. A number of certificates have been presented to him for Federal service rendered in connection with our country's war and economic efforts.

Since 1923, Speer has been president, general manager and chairman of the board of the Baltimore Salesbook Co., and more recently also of Baltimore Business Forms Co. These huge printing firms have offices in all sections of the United States. Like the newspapers, these companies have expanded many times under Speer's leadership.

He also is president-publisher of the Capital-Gazette Press, Inc. of Annapolis, Md., which publishes the Maryland Gazette—America's oldest newspaper—the daily Evening Capital, the weekly Brooklyn (Md.) News, and the County News.

And in 1951, he created the philanthropic Talbot T. Speer Foundation.

Speer was born in Pittsburgh, Pa., and was educated at the Brenns and Bradshaw Schools, Pittsburgh, the Episcopal High School, Alexandria, Va., the University of Virginia and the University of Maryland.

#### TOOK OVER REINS IN 1921

He was a salesman for the Daniel Miller Co., of Baltimore, from 1919 to 1921, became the assistant to the president of the Baltimore Salesbook Co. in 1921 and that same year became president and chairman of the board of the company.

He is the founder and president of National Education Fund, Inc., of Baltimore.

Speer lives at Friendship Hill, in Baltimore County, and also owns a large estate directly on the ocean at Delray Beach, Fla. He and Mrs. Speer has three sons, Talbot T. Speer, Jr., J. L. Dawson Speer III, and Ramsey Speer, and a daughter, Jane Alexander Speer.

Speer has been a director of the Union Trust Co. of Maryland since 1947 and was a director of the Baltimore Association of Commerce 1935-40, Baltimore Convention Bureau, 1946-48, the County Taxpayers League of Baltimore County since 1945, and a director of the U.S. Naval Academy Foundation, 1950-54.

He has been a member of the Higher Education Commission of Maryland since 1945, and was on the prison board, 1948-50, the War Production Board, 1940-1945, the Industrial Mobilization Commission since 1950 and the U.S. Army Advisory Commission since 1947.

#### LONG ACTIVE IN N.A.M.

A member of the National Association of Manufacturers, he was a senior director representing Maryland from 1947-1950. He is a member of the Accounting Supply Manufacturers Association, a director of the Associated Industries of Maryland, being president in 1951; president of the Salesbook Manufacturers Association, and was president of the Alumni Association, the University of Maryland for 2 years starting in 1950.

Speer also is a member of the Newcomen Society, the Navy League, the Society of the First Division, AEF; American Legion, Purple Heart, and Delta Psi. He is an Episcopalian, being member of the lay council, pro-cathedral of Maryland, 1925-1954.

Internal Revenue Code, provided such expenditures are reasonable in amount and bear a direct relation to the advertiser's business. However, to the extent that amounts paid for such advertising (1) are not reasonable in amount, (2) do not bear a direct relation to the advertiser's business, or (3) exceed the advertising value of the space required, they will be considered as contributions to a political organization and are not allowable as deductions for income tax purposes.

Also, in the case of *Denise Coal Company, et al. v. Commissioner*, 28 T.C. 528 (1957) acquiescence C.B. 1958-2, 5, the Tax Court held that an expenditure for the cost for an advertisement in the 1948 Democratic National Convention program represented an ordinary and necessary business expense and was deductible for income tax purposes.

The Commissioner proposed to disallow the \$7,500 paid by Denise for the space in the program on the grounds that it represented a political contribution. The expenditure was considered to be a political contribution mainly because the president of the company, Charles J. Margiotti, was a prominent political figure in Pennsylvania and because the subject matter extolled the Democratic Party rather than Denise's products.

The Tax Court was satisfied from the record that the purpose in making the expenditure was to publicize and create good will for Denise. In sustaining the taxpayer, the court noted that Denise's name clearly appeared on the page, the page itself was printed in very attractive color form, and the readers of the program undoubtedly knew who sponsored the page in question. In addition, the court stated that the fact Denise's advertising expenses in other years were much less than in 1948 did not render the expense nondeductible, and the fact that advertising in a different medium or in a different manner might have achieved more desirable results did not require it to substitute its judgment for that of the taxpayer.

The Commissioner acquiesced in the decision merely because it was a factual determination, supported by some evidence and could not be said to be clearly erroneous.

No rulings have been issued with respect to this matter during the past 3 years since final determinations must be made by the appropriate field offices upon examination of the income tax returns in which the deductions are claimed based on the facts in each particular case.

We are enclosing a copy of Revenue Ruling 56-343 and a copy of each of the published rulings cited therein and trust that this letter will supply the information you requested.

With kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

BERTRAND M. HARDING,  
Acting Commissioner.

U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,  
Washington, D.C., April 15, 1965.

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in reply to your letter of January 26, 1965, commenting on our letter of October 26, 1964, concerning expenditures for the purchase of advertising space in the programs of the 1964 Democratic Convention. You request advice whether the cost of tickets to political fundraising dinners is deductible as a business expense and wish to be furnished with copies of all rulings issued on this question during the past 5 years. You also request advice whether payments for tickets or boxes at the inaugural balls would be considered as necessary business expenses and thereby deductible for tax purposes.

Our letter of October 26 should not be interpreted to mean that all expenditures

for the purchase of advertising space in the official programs of national political conventions constitute ordinary and necessary business expenses deductible from gross income. These expenditures are deductible only if they meet the various tests outlined in our letter.

It is the position of the Internal Revenue Service that, to the extent the cost of tickets to a dinner held for the purpose of raising political campaign funds represents a contribution to a political organization, such cost is nondeductible. Cf. I.T. 3276, C.B. 1939-1 (part 1), 108, a copy of which was furnished you with our previous letter. Normally, the part of the cost of the ticket in excess of the value of the meal is considered to be a political contribution. It makes no difference whether the purchaser, his family, his business associates, or others actually use the tickets.

While the above cited ruling was published in 1939 under the Revenue Act of 1938, it has remained in effect under the succeeding internal revenue laws and codes. A search of our records fails to disclose the issuance of any rulings within the past 5 years to the effect that any expenditures of this type are deductible for income tax purposes.

Regarding your question of whether expenditures for tickets to presidential inaugural balls will give rise to deductions for income tax purposes, it is important to note that the Presidential Inaugural Committee is quite distinguishable from a political party and thus the treatment described above with respect to payments for political fund raising dinners will not prevail. Such committee is originally organized on a bipartisan basis by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia. In 1961, the excess of receipts over expenses (except for certain profits contributed to a reserve fund to be used for operations by the succeeding Inaugural Committee), over \$200,000, was donated to the United Givers Fund. Accordingly, the rule with respect to contributions to political parties is not believed to be applicable and hence the cost of tickets to presidential inaugural balls are treated in the same manner as the expense for any other tickets to entertainment events (e.g., tickets to concerts, sporting events, or theaters). Consequently, expenses for presidential inaugural ball tickets are deductible whether used by the purchaser or given away if the taxpayer can satisfy the provisions of sections 162 and 274. In other words, the taxpayer must, in general, establish that such expenses are ordinary and necessary to the carrying on of his trade or business and either (1) directly related to the active conduct of his trade or business, or (2) in the event that the inaugural ball directly precedes or follows a substantial and bona fide business discussion, associated with the active conduct of his trade or business. In no event may a taxpayer deduct the cost of tickets which he uses solely for personal reasons.

Determinations under sections 162 and 174 of the Code, referred to above, are primarily factual and are customarily made by the field organization of the Service when a taxpayer's return is examined.

We trust that the foregoing is all the information you desire. If not, please do not hesitate to call on us again.

With kind regards,

Sincerely,

SHELDON S. COHEN,  
Commissioner.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I could use the remaining time in the morning hour, but I would not like to trespass on the time of other Senators. So if any other Member of the Senate

wishes to use time, I shall be glad to defer my speech.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I do not believe there are any speakers on this side of the aisle, so we shall be glad to defer to the gracious and lovely Senator from Oregon.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have the remaining time in the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, what was the request?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. That I have the remaining time in the morning hour.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, may I suggest that this time be given to the Senator from Oregon. If any further time is required in addition, we can ask for an extension of the morning hour business.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. That is agreeable to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### THE VIETNAM WAR

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, this is a difficult speech for me to make. I am not a specialist in foreign affairs. I am not privy to classified information on developments in southeast Asia. I cannot present today any bold new proposals to end the Vietnam hostilities. I am what must appear to be one of the few Senators who has not made a pilgrimage to that war-ravaged land which has not known peace in 25 years.

My remarks today are the result of personal observations and conversations during home visits between congressional sessions. These impressions can be summarized in the following:

First. The President deserves great credit for launching his peace offensive and for temporarily halting the bombing of North Vietnam.

Second. The Senate can take pride in the realistic assessment of Vietnam which Senator MANSFIELD and our other four able colleagues have made in their report to the President.

Third. The American people do not have a clear understanding of why we are in Vietnam nor of the consequences of our stated policies there.

Fourth. A significant contribution which we in the Senate can make to improve this understanding is to have the Senate Foreign Relations Committee conduct public hearings on Vietnam, inviting not only administration spokesmen to appear but nongovernmental figures as well.

#### THE JOHNSON PEACE OFFENSIVE

We have been in Vietnam for 12 years and in that time the cost in lives, material, and dollars has moved inexorably up. As the size of our commitment has increased, so have the pressures on the President. The greater the involvement, the more justification necessary for these human and material sacrifices.

The result is less room for maneuver in seeking a settlement on anything but a purely military victory.



January 26, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1169

Pictures of the President and snippets of his speeches are scattered through the handsomely illustrated text.

Rickling in \$15,000 apiece for the project—a brain child of Democratic National Treasurer Richard Maguire—are such giants of the business establishment as General Motors, Ford, Chrysler, General Tire and Xerox Corp.

Big defense contractors, like Lockheed, Sperry-Rand, Hughes Aircraft, Martin-Marietta, and Ling-Temco Vought, also paid their share.

Harvey Aluminum, which got slapped down by the Administration last month when it tried to raise its prices, bought a page to "join in honoring an illustrious President, a distinguished Congress, and an outstanding administration, impressive in accomplishments and dedicated to the principles of democracy."

Another victim of the aluminum price war, Alcoa, also bought an ad but skipped the schmaltz.

International Telephone & Telegraph used its page to brag of its accomplishments at the Camp Kilmer Job Corps. Elsewhere in the book appears an article by poverty war Chief Sargent Shriver, who holds the strings on ITT's contract.

A number of businesses subject to Federal regulation bought ads—like railroads, airlines, pipelines, and shipping lines eager for Government subsidies.

Southern Railway filled two pages with an impassioned appeal to Congress to cut freight rates.

Pepsi-Cola, whose lawyer is Richard Nixon, bought the inside front cover; Coca-Cola holds down the back cover. Pabst and Schlitz, the beer makers, got inside ads.

Las Vegas' gaudy Sahara Hotel, and New York's upper-crusty Carlyle, favorite of the Kennedy clan, coughed up for the administration.

Six ad pages weren't sold and were donated to worthy causes like saving bonds, anti-litterbugs, and the Peace Corps.

Expenses of publishing the book are estimated at less than \$100,000.

The remaining \$900,000 or so will be turned over to a series of State committees on voter education. Such committees have been organized in about 20 States by Democrats as a thinly disguised fundraising device.

The money is supposed to be used for registration, get out the vote, and other voter education drives—not specifically to elect Democratic Congressman Zilch or defeat Republican Congressman Jones.

However, a spokesman for the Democratic National Committee acknowledged that "obviously, they are going to try to register and vote people who support the President's program."

Even so, the spokesman insisted, the ads do not represent "political contributions" by the corporations, forbidden under the Corrupt Practices Act.

About 250,000 of the books were printed. They will be distributed free to people who attend a series of fundraising movie premieres expected to net another \$2 to \$3 million for voter education.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Dec. 14, 1966]

## RAISING MONEY THE DEMOCRATIC WAY

Unless you are a member of the faithful and are going to attend one of the fundraising theater galas being put on around the Nation by the Democratic Party, you may not get to see the magazine, "Toward An Age of Greatness," which has been printed in the party's behalf. Which is too bad, because it is some magazine.

Impressive in format—176 pages, about the size of Fortune magazine, embellished with photographs—it contains articles by such public figures as Secretary of Commerce

John T. Connor, Labor Secretary Willard Wirtz and Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman, all of whom say their Departments are doing a wonderful job for the American people. There is a preface by Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY who proclaims, among other things, that the 1st session of the 89th Congress "was the greatest of any session of Congress since the Republic began."

There also are some impressive advertisements in the magazine, at \$15,000 per page.

Among the advertisers are International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., which mentions its subsidiary, Federal Electric Corp., operator of the Federal Job Corps center at Camp Kilmer, N.J.; General Motors, which does some governmental defense business; Tennessee Gas Transmission Co., which gets its pipeline franchises from the Government; the hotels Sahara in Las Vegas and Carlyle (a favorite Democratic hostelry) in New York City; major aircraft manufacturers including Lockheed, Hughes Aircraft and Grumman, and two aluminum companies. One, Harvey Aluminum, says: "We join in honoring an illustrious President, a distinguished Congress, and an outstanding administration, impressive in accomplishments and dedicated to the principles of Democracy," with a capital D.

The revenue from these advertisers, almost 70 in all, does not, of course, go to the Democratic National Committee for party campaign expenses. The magazine is published by the party's State committee on voter education, so it is an educational venture; if it were a political gimmick all the advertisers could be hauled into court for violating the Corrupt Practices Act. The \$900,000 in revenue which the State committees will share is to be used for pre-election registration, get-out-the-vote and similar nonpartisan drives.

How many American corporations were approached as potential advertisers but declined to participate we do not know. By and large, though, we'd say they showed considerable courage and pretty good judgment.

## EXHIBIT 2

U.S. SENATE.

Washington, D.C., December 21, 1965.

Attorney General NICHOLAS KATZENBACH,  
Department of Justice,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: Enclosed are copies of two newspaper articles which appeared in recent issues of the Washington papers. One article, which appeared in the Washington Post, was written by Mr. Robert S. Boyd and is entitled "Sixty-eight Firms Finance Johnson Booster-Book." The second article, entitled "Fundraising Book Ready," was written by Mr. Walter Pincus and appeared in the Washington Star. Both of these articles refer to the sale of advertising rates at \$15,000 per page in a recent campaign brochure.

Also enclosed is a copy of sections 610, 611 of title 18, United States Code, relating to prohibiting corporations from making contributions to political organizations.

I would appreciate answers to the following:

1. Are these contributions (which are being made under the guise of advertising) in violation of the above-mentioned law or in violation of any other section of Federal law?

(a) If not can we assume that all political parties can use this advertising gimmick as a method of bypassing the law and thereby soliciting contributions from corporations; and if this is possible are we to assume that there will now be no limit as to the amount which a corporation can contribute?

(b) If it should be your determination that this gimmick is in violation of existing law, what steps is the Department taking in the cases outlined?

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,  
Washington, January 10, 1966.

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,  
U. S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The Attorney General has asked me to reply to your letter of December 21, 1965, concerning two newspaper articles, one of which appeared in the Washington Post and the other in the Evening Star. These articles report that various corporations have taken advertising in a publication entitled "Toward an Age of Greatness" and you ask if we can determine, on the basis of these newspaper articles, whether violations of sections 610 and 611 of title 18, United States Code, are indicated.

Section 610, in pertinent part, proscribes corporate contributions or expenditures "in connection with any election at which presidential and vice presidential electors or a Senator or Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to Congress are to be voted for, or in connection with any primary election or political convention or caucus held to select candidates for any of the foregoing offices." The legislative history of section 611 reveals that it is not applicable to corporations.

The Evening Star article, which you forwarded, notes without further comment that the money raised by the publication will go to various "independent" committees on voter education. The Washington Post story states that the money "will be turned over to a series of State Committees on Voter Education," which the author of the story concludes are "a thinly disguised fund-raising device."

Laying aside all conjecture, it is clear that neither newspaper article has demonstrated, or seriously attempted to demonstrate, that the advertising revenue is being used "in connection with any election at which presidential and vice presidential electors or a Senator or Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to Congress are to be voted for, or in connection with any primary election or political convention or caucus held to select candidates for any of the foregoing offices." It may be possible to speculate that at some time in the future the advertising revenue might be employed in other than the publicly announced manner, but you will appreciate that a legal conclusion cannot be predicated on such speculation.

You ask if any other Federal law might be relevant to this matter. We note section 608(b) of title 18 with the comment that, as with section 610, the facts within our knowledge do not demonstrate a violation.

Sincerely,

FRED M. VINSON, JR.,  
Assistant Attorney General.

## EXHIBIT 3

OCTOBER 26, 1964.

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in reply to your letter of September 21, 1964, concerning the deductibility of the costs of advertising space in the programs of the recent Democratic Convention. You inquire whether these expenditures are deductible for income tax purposes and request copies of all rulings issued in this area during the past 3 years.

The question as to whether expenses incurred for advertising in political publications is deductible was clarified in Revenue Ruling 56 343, published in Cumulative Bulletin 1956 2, page 115, which states that expenditures for the purchase of advertising space in the official program of a national political convention constitute ordinary and necessary business expenses, deductible from gross income under section 162(a) of the

January 26, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1171

The Vietnam war is manifestly at a state where momentous decisions are going to be made. As the Mansfield report makes clear, the military situation has accelerated severalfold during the past year, yet the result is very much like what it was before the bombing and troop increases began.

The grisly change is that the casualty figures have gone up.

Some feel that the next move is to try to intensify the military pressure on the enemy by doubling the number of our troops in the field and by increasing and expanding the bombing in both North and South Vietnam. Others would have us defend our present positions and continue the search for a settlement. Some speak of military victory, some of formal negotiations, and still others of a gradual reduction of forces without official agreement. Whatever happens, the President is the one who must make the final decisions.

President Johnson has demonstrated not only good sense, but great courage in launching his peace offensive and calling a temporary halt to U.S. bombing of North Vietnam. No one wants a war to continue which could all too easily escalate into world war and nuclear disaster.

It required courage because the President, though the commander in chief, must pit his civilian policies against those of his own field commanders who advise that a halt to the bombing in North Vietnam might result in a stronger enemy and more American men killed.

But the consequences of not making this twin effort are even more grave. We can only hope that neither side misinterprets the actions or intent of the other, as some reasonable solution is sought this side of a holocaust.

## THE MANSFIELD REPORT

There is a good deal of wry comment in the press about congressional fact-finding and investigating tours at taxpayers expense between sessions of Congress. But there can be no question about the value of the tour taken between the sessions of this Congress by Senators MANSFIELD, AIKEN, MUSKIE, INOUYE, and BOGGS, culminating in the comprehensive Mansfield report.

A more detailed analysis of their findings was made to the President, but the public version should be required reading for all who would try to understand the unenviable choices facing us in Vietnam.

The great value of the Mansfield report is that it successfully steps back from the daily press reports and gives perspective to what has and has not happened in Vietnam in the last year and what might lie ahead. I find this the best statement now available of where we stand in Vietnam.

## POLICY AND THE PUBLIC

Mr. President, the governed can give their consent to their governors only if they understand what is being asked of them. Many people have not been won over to support the Vietnam war because they do not understand why we are there. I wish to discuss some of the rea-

sons for this public hesitation to support U.S. policies in southeast Asia.

First is the war itself. No sane person wants to go to war. Americans already know that war is hell, for on three previous occasions in this century we have sent our forces to fight overseas and hundreds of thousands never returned.

Vietnam, however, is the first television war and it has brought hell into the living room. We see U.S.-destroyed villages, women and children horribly burned from our napalm bombs, and rice fields destroyed by chemicals sprayed from our planes. The memory of this human suffering in the name of freedom does not fade with the click of a television switch. And somehow, being told that the enemy is far worse does not ease the pain, for we are not responsible for their actions, only our own.

Another factor explaining the lack of public understanding of our Vietnam policies is found in the locale of the conflict. A European war is bound to have support within the United States because our people have strong historical, ethnic, religious, and family ties there. Millions of Americans are only one generation removed from Europe, and the great ocean liners and jet airplanes have turned the Atlantic into a pond.

Vietnam, on the other hand, seems foreign in every sense of the word. The Pacific is still the vast barrier of old to most of us. How many schools teach Asian languages in addition to or in place of the standard romance languages? The very word democracy as understood in the United States has little parallel in Vietnam. It is small wonder then that a U.S. war in Vietnam seems strange to the man in the street.

A third element influencing public attitudes to the Vietnam war is the failure of the administration to distinguish with enough care between rhetoric and reason in explaining our southeast Asia policies.

The protracted nature of the Vietnam war has provided ample opportunity to lay before the public the various policy alternatives available and their expected consequences. Instead, we have had incomplete rationales justifying military and political policies already put into effect. Once applied, the conditions which led to the first policy are changed and public discussion fulfills the function of a post mortem.

It can be claimed with some merit that this Nation has moved slowly in Vietnam compared to the alternatives available and that the major military and political decisions have been done with at least a degree of congressional consultation. The President received his open ended authority—as he chose to interpret it—on Vietnam from Congress following the Bay of Tonkin incident in 1964, and Congress appropriated \$700 million for Vietnam only 2 days after he requested it. Both the President and Members of Congress have been before the people to seek election within the last 18 months. The electorate did not seek candidates who deviated appreciably from administration policy.

I believe this to be an inadequate rationale. In the first place, our military

commitment in November of 1964, the last election, was very different from what it is today and what is being predicted. After all, the advocates of bombing North and South Vietnam and of defoliation were condemned in that election, yet they have become official U.S. policy.

Secondly, under our system of government, the President is charged with initiating and administering our foreign policy. As the Commander in Chief and de facto head of the State Department, any President is assumed to have the authority and information at hand to lead our policies abroad and to carry with him an automatic majority of the people in almost any short-term emergency or crisis situation.

But no President wants to have merely acquiescent and automatic support from the people. A President is of the people himself. He will want them to share his views so that by implication they can share the responsibility. Every President wants to be able to say, "I led, but you followed willingly and with understanding."

If I am any judge of the American mood today, the President would have a majority of the public behind him in just about any course of action in Vietnam he could realistically choose, but he could not say that they would do so willingly and in full understanding of the consequences.

The American people are literate and well informed. The public is not always right. But when the issue is war and all that that implies, they surely have a right to have all the factors involved in policymaking, commensurate with national security, presented to them and to participate in the discussions.

This lack of confidence in the ability of a free people to choose policies in their own interest has ironic overtones. The failure to share with the public the private debates on policy has resulted in the Vietnam case of the administration appearing to be weaker than it necessarily is, as though the policy would not stand up to public scrutiny.

Mr. President, I want to move now from the general to the specific, and illustrate the kinds of questions that are being asked about U.S. involvement in Vietnam. Some of them may appear to be naive, but they are among those I most often hear from constituents.

## CIVIL WAR VERSUS NORTH VIETNAMESE AGGRESSION

President Johnson and his advisers have made it quite clear that in their judgment the Vietnam war is a clear and documented case of aggression by North Vietnam against South Vietnam. This policy recognizes the de facto existence of two independent sovereign nations, the capitals of which are Hanoi and Saigon.

The President also said in his state of the Union message that we stand by the Geneva Agreements of 1954. The public is aware of very little of the detail of that historic agreement, but one feature they are likely to remember: The 17th parallel was provisional and was not in any way to be interpreted as

constituting a political or territorial boundary.

On the face of it, the United States is shying both that it stands on the principle that there is no political or territorial boundary separating North and South Vietnam, and that we must stand and fight in South Vietnam because that nation has been attacked by its aggressor nation to the north.

When Americans scratch their heads over this logic, they are not excusing Communist aggression nor saying that the United States ought not to be in Vietnam. It is simple puzzlement over why our stated reason for being there and our stated terms for withdrawing seem to cancel out each other.

#### THE CHINA QUESTION

Who is the primary enemy in southeast Asia? There have been two candidates nominated: Communist China and North Vietnam. The senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee] pressed the claims of the former last August in a debate with the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern]:

I think that our first priority in southeast Asia, the President has repeated it, Secretary McNamara has repeated it, Secretary Rusk has repeated it, that the first priority in southeast Asia is to contain the forces of militant expansionism from mainland China and its stooges. That is the issue, the internal politics of Vietnam comes second, not first.

Our distinguished majority leader, after a tour in that part of the world, said:

United States-Communist Chinese relations are the basic factor in our present deep involvement in southeast Asia. It was the hostility of China in Korea which first projected the United States in depth—via aid programs—into Indochina. It is Chinese hostility which evokes the continued flow of the bulk of U.S. aid and other activity into southeast Asia.

The recent visit by Secretaries Rusk and McNamara to the NATO Council is also illustrative. The reports from that meeting suggested that the U.S. spokesmen attempted to solicit military and other support for the Vietnam war from our European allies on the grounds that Peiping was using the Vietnam war as just the first step in her plan to expand Chinese Communist power throughout the world and that our European allies in their own self-interest ought to help nip this in the bud in far-off Asia rather than fight years later on their own doorstep.

The Chinese are the primary military suppliers and propaganda supporters of the Vietcong, although unlike the United States they have not yet committed any of their troops into the battle. The Mansfield report suggests that the forces opposing us in Vietnam may have or will in the future become so dependent on China for support that they may not be able to negotiate without her cooperation, rather like the relationship between Saigon and Washington.

If the expansionist desires of Communist China are the real elements in Asia which require massive U.S. forces there, it is noted that the President made no mention of it in his review of the Viet-

nam situation in the state of the Union message. And on a CBS news special last August, Gen. Maxwell Taylor said:

I recognize that behind Hanoi is Peiping, and to some degree Moscow, but their direct influence on the decisions in Hanoi are far from clear.

The American people, with great justification, dread the prospect of getting bogged down in a land war against the staggering human resources of China. Yet the chief U.S. adviser on Vietnam to two Presidents and the current Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff have told us that the judgment has been made that China will not enter the fray directly, before the North Vietnamese will be forced to stop and withdraw. Both Generals Taylor and Wheeler said in August that "self-interest—a fear of the consequences" would keep China out of the war.

The Mansfield report does not mention this as a factor in Chinese thinking in its listing of the reasons why China has not introduced her manpower into the conflict. If we assume that the Chinese are afraid of the United States, the world could pay an awful price for this mutual ignorance of character and intentions.

#### THE LACK OF ALLIED SUPPORT IN VIETNAM

The lack of favorable response by our NATO allies to our yellow peril argument is but one facet of the larger issue of general support for U.S. policies in Vietnam.

The State Department lists over 35 nations contributing to our efforts there. Military contributions have come from Australia, with 1,200 troops, a 150-man artillery unit from New Zealand, and 20,000 South Koreans. Almost all the other contributions are in the nature of aid to the South Vietnamese victims of the war, providing food, clothing, building materials, medicine, technicians, money and credit, doctors, and teachers. All of this and more is desperately needed, but it is quite true that these expressions of compassion for the South Vietnamese victims of war need not be interpreted as support for U.S. Vietnam policies.

The Mansfield report put the situation bluntly and pointed to its consequence:

With a few exceptions, assistance has not been and is not likely to be forthcoming for the war effort in South Vietnam from nations other than the United States. On the contrary, as it now appears, the longer the war continues in its present pattern and the more it expands in scope, the greater will become the strain placed upon the relations of the United States with allies both in the Far East and in Europe.

Could it be that our allies agree completely with the U.S. position, but believe their own commitments preclude military aid?

Could it be that some of our allies prefer the United States to bear all the responsibility and all the losses, while enjoying the security which our effort gives them? I am reminded of the subtlety of phrase used by Senator MANSFIELD in his 1963 Vietnam report:

For in the last analysis if the United States is willing to bear the preponderant burdens of freedom in southeast Asia, out of

concern with Chinese hostility, communism, or whatever, the likelihood is that other free nations will not be overly inclined to deny us the privilege.

Or do our allies simply disagree with U.S. premises about the past, present, and future of southeast Asia? I cannot help wondering when after the United States has named North Vietnam as the aggressor nation and has bombed her for 10 months prior to the present moratorium, several of our allies have continued to trade with North Vietnam or have allowed ships flying their flags to do so.

Even the nations of Asia who would be most affected by a Communist takeover in Vietnam have not rallied around the U.S. banner with the support one might have expected if the domino theory was widely shared abroad. It is difficult to believe that the mainland nations of Asia would prefer a Communist Vietnam, but it is not self-evident whether that prospect appears as grim to the Asians as it does to the administration. According to the Mansfield report, each Asian country "has, as a principal concern, the avoidance of direct involvement in the Vietnamese conflict."

Presumably, Cambodia has the most to fear of a Communist Vietnam, because of the long common border. Yet this month, the Cambodian Government informed the United Nations that it would retaliate against United States and/or South Vietnamese forces if they continued to violate the Cambodian borders in pursuit of the Vietcong. The letter strongly implied that the Cambodians would seek assistance from China in doing so.

Laos, another border nation of the Vietnams, is being bombed by U.S. planes because the Vietcong freely use Laotian territory to infiltrate supplies and personnel from North Vietnam.

Even the generous military commitment by the South Koreans is clouded in dispute. The economic health of that nation is directly tied to the continued good will of the United States, and her army is 100 percent U.S. trained and equipped. To guarantee the continued independence of Korea, the United States believes it necessary to keep a force of not less than 50,000 troops there. In these circumstances, many have questioned whether the 20,000 South Korean troops are in Vietnam in response to the call of freedom or due to pressure to make the Vietnam conflict something other than a U.S. solo effort.

Burma has washed her hands of the whole affair. The archipelago nation of Indonesia has just dealt the Communists within her borders a stunning defeat, without U.S. assistance, and neither she nor the Philippines has felt it necessary to join the Vietnam fray. Japan has no military force to offer even if it was so inclined. However, an article by Stanley Karnow in the January 13 Washington Post stated that "Japan is expected to become Communist China's principal commercial partner this year," increasing to at least \$540 million, or over 15 percent of the total foreign trade of Communist China.



January 26, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1173

If the rest of the world is going to put up signs reading "Business as Usual" whether the United States fights in Vietnam or not, the American people can be forgiven for wondering if the rewards are worth the fight.

#### U.S. BASES IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

The administration has emphasized repeatedly that the United States has no permanent designs on Asia. As soon as the North Vietnamese and Vietcong stop their aggression and the security of South Vietnam is no longer in question, we will withdraw. As President Johnson said in his state of the Union message, "we seek neither territory nor bases, economic domination or military alliance in Vietnam."

There are observers who suggest that this language oversimplifies to the point of easy misinterpretation by friend and foe alike. For example, last August 27, James Reston wrote in the New York Times:

The U.S. base at Canranh, which has one of the best natural ports in Asia, is being developed into another Okinawa, not merely for the purpose of this war, but as a major power complex from which American officials hope a wider alliance of Asian nations, with the help of the United States, will eventually be able to contain the expansion of China.

Mr. Reston and others are suggesting that, if we mean that we have no permanent designs on Asia and we will withdraw from all bases as soon as the threat to Vietnam no longer exists, how does the United States define threat? If the threat is open warfare in South Vietnam, we mean one thing. If the threat is the presence of a belligerent China, we mean quite another. Failure to distinguish these points more clearly could lead unnecessarily to a questioning at home and abroad of U.S. judgment.

#### THE QUESTION OF WHO IS IN CHARGE IN VIETNAM

The United States is in Vietnam in response to continuing requests for help from a series of South Vietnamese Governments. Secretary McNamara said last year:

The defense of South Vietnam is not being directed by the United States. The defense of South Vietnam is being directed by the Government of South Vietnam. \* \* \* Our soldiers will operate under the command of U.S. officers, but it will be in a supplementary role, and we are not assuming direction of the military program there.

Two weeks ago, it was reported that the largest U.S. military engagement of the war, involving 8,000 of our troops, was launched in the Iron Triangle region not far from Saigon. The distinguishing feature of the maneuver was that the whole operation was put into effect without informing the South Vietnamese military, for fear of a security leak.

An even more obvious area of misunderstanding exists in the current peace offensive as seen from Washington and from Saigon. The world is not looking to South Vietnamese Premier Ky for proposals to end the war. The South Vietnamese Foreign Minister was reported January 14 as saying that the Vietnam war can only be resolved on the battlefield and that it is not negotiable.

No one is suggesting that U.S. troops ought to be under the command of Sai-

gon or that all efforts to end the hostilities short of world war ought to be left to the colorful Ky. But to be told, as we were in the past 2 weeks, that the largest U.S. military operation and the most significant peace probe of the war were both launched without prior reference to the South Vietnam Government appears on the surface to be a major shift in United States-Vietnamese policy without public explanation.

#### BULLETS AND BALLOTS

The American position supporting free elections in Vietnam after the hostilities have ceased is consistent with our democratic heritage and the announced desires of the Saigon military government. The President reaffirmed this principle in his state of the Union message:

We fight for the principle of self-determination that the people of South Vietnam should be able to choose their own course, choose it in free elections without violence without terror, and without fear.

A general commitment to free elections in Vietnam begs several questions. A glance by a layman at a map of South Vietnam today reveals a crazy-quilt pattern of areas controlled or contested by the two sides. Most of the land is in Vietcong territory and most of the population is under United States and Government protection. Assuming a cease fire under these circumstances, could a national election take place which had meaning? There is no individual or party in South Vietnam which has grass roots national identification, with the presumed exception of the National Liberation Front—NLF. Would elections take place in those areas of the country controlled by the Vietcong? How would candidates be selected?

It is obvious that any election which took place for a national government under the existing pattern of land and population control would be a coalition government including NLF or its sympathizers.

What is the meaning of "free elections" to South Vietnamese who live in areas controlled by Vietcong. The Vietcong has systematically murdered all unsympathetic leadership in hundreds of villages, and has extorted money, food, and personnel from the general population. Some of these areas have been dominated by the Vietcong for 10 years, although much of the population may be dead or have fled to refugee camps. A "free election" in this context is ridiculous.

The very able junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has conducted Senate hearings and focused public attention on the plight of the dispossessed South Vietnamese now exiling in wretched refugee camps throughout the country. There are approximately 1 million people jammed into these camps. In an election, would these refugees return to their native areas, or stay where they are? Would their vote count as being cast for political figures standing in the locales of the camps or for their home regions and villages? These tragic people are dependent for their food, clothing, and housing on the Saigon government. The opportunity for pressuring refugee votes in these circumstances is self-evident.

In any election which was really free, whether on the issue of political leadership or that of reunification, the Montagnards and related ethnic groups in South Vietnam would cry, "Pox on all your houses," and would choose independence for themselves.

South Vietnam is overwhelmingly Buddhist. Pacifism is a strong element within that faith. Looking at the situation realistically, rather than as we would like it to be, can it be predicted with some confidence that a Buddhist people can successfully protect their interests against an aggressive and unscrupulous Communist movement, even when the Communists eschew violence? I have heard no administration spokesman tested on this issue, yet it seems basic to the nature of any settlement which we might propose.

General Taylor once suggested that he could envisage another partition of population such as took place in 1954, those wanting to go north to the region of Hanoi doing so, and those who remained south could come forward under a general amnesty and be accepted back into South Vietnamese citizenship. Such a course would obviate several of the questions just raised and is consistent with the negotiating points put forward by Saigon.

Unfortunately, it is difficult to believe that this proposal would be acceptable to the Vietcong and North Vietnam. From their point of view, it was partition with the promise of elections within 2 years which prevented Vietnam from being united under Ho Chi Minh 12 years ago. In essence, we would be expecting them to give up everything they have fought for, with nothing in return except the same promises that were given last time.

If these two policy suggestions are representative of the only available alternatives to the polarized positions of pulling out or "bombing them into the Stone Age," then an early solution to Vietnam is indeed a long way down a deadly road.

#### SENATE HEARINGS ON VIETNAM

The administration is not alone in its reluctance to accept the responsibilities of stimulating public understanding of our Vietnam policies. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee is in a unique position to focus public attention on this issue, but has not done so. I fully appreciate that the committee may have wished to move with some caution in this field, for there will be those who would leap to the conclusion that any information or contention brought out at such hearings which differed in any respect from that presented by the administration would undermine the efforts of the President to resolve the conflict.

I firmly believe that further hesitation is not in the best interests of our Vietnam policy, and respectfully urge the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and the able colleagues who serve with him to schedule public hearings on the subject of our southeast Asia policy. I would include administration spokesmen, representatives from the universities, foundations,

and other groups and organizations which have expressed a particular interest in Vietnam.

Some of the support for the rather bizarre forms of protest and demonstration indulged in this past year by normally responsible people might have been lessened if Vietnam public hearings had been scheduled. Obviously, many who flock to protest rallies are exhibitionists of the "rent-a-picket-for-a-day" variety, but to categorize all or most of the participants as such is unjustified.

A more plausible explanation for the distinctive character of the demonstrations is that frustration built up in the minds of many sincere and patriotic citizens who could see no place within the framework of government where a viewpoint other than that expressed by the administration could receive a fair hearing and could be expected to have some effect on future national policy. Whether it is an accurate charge or not, the administration has been widely viewed as more interested in justifying its actions on its own terms than in being sympathetic and receptive to alternative policy proposals in Vietnam.

Several members of the Foreign Relations Committee and others, have with great eloquence and vigor brought their individual views on the Vietnam conflict to public attention, but this is not an adequate substitute for the orderly record and penetrating probe which could be prepared and conducted by the full committee. No one wants security to be breached in these hearings, but surely it is possible to define more closely the reasons behind the policy judgments now guiding our actions in Vietnam.

I am struck by the concern expressed in the Washington Post recently by George Kennan that our commitment of personnel and diplomatic attention to Vietnam is so complete that it is creating a detrimental imbalance within our foreign policy:

"The most disturbing aspect of our involvement in Vietnam is its relationship to our interests and responsibilities in other areas of world affairs. Whatever justification this involvement might have had if Vietnam had been the only important problem, or even the outstanding problem, we faced in the world today, this not being the case, its present dimensions can only be said to represent a grievous disbalance of American policy.

For nearly a year now, we have sacrificed to this effort all serious possibility for improvement of our relations with the Soviet Union, with all this implies from the standpoint of the ultimate danger of nuclear war, and this we have done at a time when prospects for such improvement were otherwise not unfavorable. We have placed a great and deeply regrettable strain on the friendship and confidence of the Japanese people.

A pall of discouragement has been cast over those responsible for the conduct of the work of the United Nations. Constructive treatment of the great problems of Germany, of nuclear disarmament, of the future of the United Nations and of China in the wider sense has everywhere been placed largely in abeyance in deference to this one remote involvement.

All of these problems are more important, for the long term, than what happens in Vietnam, and there is none of them that will be usefully met even by such further military successes as we may have in the Vietnam area—rather the contrary.

This is a serious charge by one so experienced in the past conduct of our diplomacy. It merits serious consideration by Congress and a thoughtful reply from the administration. A useful step in this direction would be an invitation to Ambassador Kennan to appear before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to elaborate on his concern just quoted.

Mr. President, whatever our views on the justification and tactics of the Vietnam war, no one can envy the responsibilities of our President. His dilemma is how to develop and execute courses of action which will neither violate the historic U.S. commitment to independence and freedom in the world, nor plunge us into nuclear chaos.

It has been my contention today that the Senate can do more than it has in the past to help the President clarify the choices available to us in Vietnam. I also believe that this administration could help itself by rationing its rhetoric.

#### RESOLUTION BY RICHFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, WACO, TEX., IN SUPPORT OF FREE PEOPLE OF SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the student council of a very fine high school in my State, Richfield High School in Waco, Tex., recently passed a resolution in support of the free people of South Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RICHFIELD HIGH SCHOOL,  
Waco, Tex., December 6, 1965.

THE PRESIDENT,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

Mr. PRESIDENT: The following resolution was passed by the Student Council of Richfield High School in Waco, Tex. on December 6, 1965:

"Whereas it is our firm belief that the blessings of individual freedom should be preserved and defended by and for our fellow men through a strict doctrine of open and unrestricted self-determination; and

"Whereas this doctrine is violated by the invasion of the lands and rights of the peoples of the Republic of (South) Vietnam by the agents of the (Communist) Democratic Republic of (North) Vietnam acting as a puppet of the People's Republic of China; and

"Whereas the people of South Vietnam have specifically requested and continuously supported the aid and intervention of the people of the United States of America; and

"Whereas the people of the United States have responded with men and arms to the plea of the people of South Vietnam and have sent their sons and brothers to fight and die for the freedom of the Vietnamese and, more indirectly, for themselves; and

"Whereas certain groups and individuals have expressed through word and deed their dissatisfaction and disagreement with the policies of the Government and people of the United States to a degree that would falsely suggest their representation of a majority of Americans and in a manner irresponsibly disregarding the laws of the United States: Therefore, be it

"Resolved by the student council, That—

"1. The student council solemnly affirm its open and unrestricted support of the present policies of the Government of the United

States regarding the Republic of (South) Vietnam and her enemies;

"2. The student council further condemn those who would irresponsibly abandon a free people to dictatorship and would shirk their duty to the Nation by defying her laws;

"3. The student council shall sponsor a petition to be circulated among the student body of Richfield expressing approval of the above resolutions; and

"4. The student council shall forward this petition to the President of the United States of America, with copies of the above resolution to the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the U.S. Ambassador to South Vietnam, the U.S. commandant in Vietnam, Senator JOHN TOWER, Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, and Congressman BOB POAGE."

Respectfully yours,

RICHFIELD HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT

COUNCIL,

MICHAEL C. LESKIN, President.

H. MARVIN JENNINGS, Principal.

JEANETTE MAXWELL, Sponsor.

#### RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF U.S. POLICY IN VIETNAM

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Gragg-Sherrill Post No. 248, of the American Legion, Corpus Christi, Tex., has adopted an excellent resolution relative to the war in Vietnam and Communist tyranny. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRAGG-SHERRILL POST NO. 248,

THE AMERICAN LEGION,

Corpus Christi, Tex., December 14, 1965

ADVOCACY OF THE POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES IN VIETNAM AND CONDEMNATION OF TREASON

Whereas the tyrannical ruling castes of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (U.S.S.R.), Red China, and their servile satellite nations, including North Vietnam and Cuba, are determined by subversion, terrorism, murder, and oppression, as well as by massive military invasion and conquest, to compel the free nation of South Vietnam to surrender its freedom and submit to enslavement under the diabolic domination of international communism; and

Whereas if South Vietnam falls to the Machiavellian forces of communism and is imprisoned behind Iron and Bamboo Curtains, then all southeast Asia must yield to the evil might of communistic oppression; and

Whereas in Santa Domingo, South and Central America, the satanic imperialists of the U.S.S.R., Red China, and Red Cuba seek the overthrow of the free, democratic governments by Communist inspired, directed, and controlled armed violence; and

Whereas treasonable individuals and organized groups within the United States are giving direct aid and comfort to our enemies in violation of section 3, article III, Constitution of the United States of America by anti-United States and procommunism demonstrations, exhibitions, marches, speeches, printed material, and draft card burning, etc.; and

\* Whereas the U.S. Government has irrevocably announced that it will defend and maintain the freedom of all non-Communist nations of the world; if necessary, with its Armed Forces, as it now is doing in Vietnam, Santa Domingo, Thailand, Japan, South Korea, Formosa, and Europe--to name a few nations of the free world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Gragg-Sherrill Post No. 248, the American Legion, assembled in regular meeting in Corpus Christi, Tex., this 14th day of December, 1965, declares and

January 26, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1175

affirms that it totally supports the policy of the U.S. Government to defend and maintain the independence and freedom of all democratic governments of the Western World; to permit no further encroachment by the diabolic evils of communism on free nations anywhere at anytime; and to defeat the enemies of South Vietnam, using the full might and potential of its Armed Forces and armaments; and, further be it

*Resolved*, That the U.S. Government take immediate and effective action to punish the traitorous and reasonable citizens and their Communist abettors who by word or deed are opposing the use of the Armed Forces of the United States in defending the free, democratic nations of the world, particularly those who speak and act against our defense of South Vietnam.

Attest:

VERN BELL,  
*Commander.*  
LESTER W. WOLFORD,  
*Adjutant.*  
NELS L. SODERHOLM,  
*Judge Advocate.*

### RESOLUTION URGING PREVENTION OF SHIPMENT OF ARMS AND MUNITIONS OF WAR TO COMMUNIST NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Allen Brothers Post No. 148, the American Legion, of Lubbock, Tex., has adopted a very fine resolution in support of the U.S. posture in Vietnam and articulating their opposition to any further shipments of armaments and munitions to North Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,  
ALLEN BROTHERS POST NO. 148,  
Lubbock, Tex., December 15, 1965.

Whereas it has been reported in the news media on numerous occasions that the Communist enemy in North Vietnam continues to receive all types of armaments and munitions, including missiles, by sea without interference from our naval forces, and

Whereas it has been reported on numerous occasions that our highest ranking military officers have been pleading with the President to grant authority to our naval forces to prevent these said shipments of armaments and munitions into Communist North Vietnam: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Allen Brothers American Legion Post No. 148 of Lubbock, Tex., does hereby join with our competent high-ranking military leaders in urging the President to grant authority to our naval forces to prevent any further shipment of armaments and munitions of war into Communist North Vietnam; and, furthermore, be it

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President, the Vice President, the Secretary of State, the ranking officers of each of the military services, to the U.S. Senators from Texas, to the U.S. Representatives from Texas, to 19th District of Texas American Legion, to the Department of Texas American Legion, to the national commander of the American Legion, and to the news media of radio, television, and press.

This resolution approved by the Allen Brothers Post No. 148 in its regular meeting of December 14, 1965.

BILL R. NEEL, *Adjutant.*

### EDITORIAL OPPOSITION TO REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, editorialization in Texas newspapers has been almost unanimously against the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

I ask unanimous consent that an excellent editorial entitled "Section 14(b) Fight Can Be Two-Edged Sword," published in the Abilene Reporter-News of December 28, 1965, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### SECTION 14(b) FIGHT CAN BE TWO-EDGED SWORD

The Nation's union leaders are put on notice by Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, that the fight against repeal of the union shop ban will not be entirely defensive by nature.

Opponents of repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act have amendments in readiness that would require more democratic procedures within unions, in effect lessening the hold of labor leaders over the union rank and file. The labor issue is a readymade vehicle on which to attack discrimination in the tightly knit organizations and sponsors of the fight against repeal of section 14(b) are hinting broadly that racial characteristics of organized labor will be probed.

In their determination to repeal section 14(b), the labor leaders may have overlooked the possibility of losing as much as they gain by repeal. They should remember that Senator DIRKSEN and his associates in both parties are capable of driving hard bargains in the interests of States rights.

It is not beyond the realm of possibility that renewal of the labor issue could result in nondiscriminatory legislation and retention of section 14(b).

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an excellent editorial entitled "Battle Against 14(b)," published in my hometown newspaper, the Wichita Falls Record-News of December 30, 1965.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### BATTLE AGAINST 14(b)

Opponents of the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, relaxed last year when the Senate failed to pass the proposed action. The House of Representatives already had approved repeal, and approval was dangerously close in the Senate.

Most Washington reporters and editors believe a much more aggressive campaign for repeal will be waged during the 2d session of the 89th Congress opening next week. For this reason those who are opposed to such action cannot afford to stay relaxed. They do face what probably will be one of the most bitterly waged campaigns in recent history.

The section, popularly called the right-to-work law, makes it possible for States to enact legislation permitting the worker to decide for himself whether or not he wishes to join a union.

Those who approve 14(b) consider it an inherent right possessed by every individual to decide whether or not he wishes to be a union member. Repeal of this section would deprive the worker of that freedom.

We now have on the books a series of

laws which prevent discrimination for reasons of race, color, creed, or sex. If a worker does not wish to join a union, should he be subject to discrimination?

It is not antithetical to support freedom of choice for all workers.

### PROSPERING EAST TEXAS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, every January 1 the publisher of the Longview, Tex., Morning Journal, Mr. Carl Estes, and his staff associates publish a special New Year's Day edition, which contains many pages and requires many weeks of preparation. This special edition gives a review of that great land of opportunity, East Texas, and its business, agricultural, social, and historical developments. This annual edition has become a collector's item because it is a valuable source of reference concerning East Texas.

On January 5, 1966, the Dallas Morning News published an excellent editorial commenting on this fine annual edition published by Mr. Estes, and noting the changes that have occurred in East Texas.

I can remember that when I was a boy cotton and peanuts were raised on the sandy land. We poor farmers. But now East Texas is verdant with pasture grass, and we see thousands upon thousands of head of the finest blooded cattle roaming the East Texas hills.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the editorial entitled "East Texas' Estes."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, Jan. 5, 1966]

#### EAST TEXAS' ESTES

In East Texas, New Year's Day came in with a monumental edition of the Longview Morning Journal—566 pages chock full of information about the past, present, and potential of that prospering, growing region and city.

"Opportunity Land," title of the front-page editorial, aptly describes the area. Industrial developments, new lakes and other tourist attractions, over 33,000 jobs in Gregg County, alone, plans for navigation of the Sabine River are but a few of the hundreds of evidences of opportunity developed or developing from the Louisiana boundary to the doorsteps of Dallas.

Key figure in many of these advancements today, as he has been for many years, is Carl Estes, publisher of the Longview newspapers. Aided by an able staff, he produces a January 1 edition each year that is the envy of fellow publishers and a keepsake for historians, business analysts, and others.

His 1966 achievement not only is the finest yet, but a newspaper to challenge the best efforts of everyone in the future. And everyone includes not only the staff of the Longview Morning Journal, but newspapermen from California to the Carolinas.

Massive changes have taken place in East Texas. Hills that once ran red with water eroding between rows of corn and cotton now are brightened by the crimson of clover grazed by beef and dairy herds. Where mules not long ago turned sirup mills now stand plants turning out huge machines,



beer and containers to put it in, to mention only a few.

"The foundations are laid and new walls of progress are going up in the mighty Sabine-Cypress inland empire," comments our neighbor to the east of Dallas. This city and newspaper heartily concur and proudly team up with East Texans to help build those foundations and walls.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further routine business?

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, there appears to be no more routine business to be transacted within the time agreed upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further routine business to be transacted, the time under the unanimous-consent agreement has expired.

Mr. TOWER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

#### [No. 14 Leg.]

Burdick	Javits	Randolph
Cooper	Long, Mo.	Ribicoff
Dirksen	Long, La.	Russell
Douglas	Mansfield	Talmadge
Gruning	McIntyre	Tower
Harris	Mundt	Tydings
Hart	Neuberger	Williams, Del.
Holland	Pastore	Young, Ohio
Inouye	Pell	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BASS, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. FONG, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GORE, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HILL, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. MORTON, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. PROXMIER, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina, Mr. SALTSTALL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SIMPSON, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

#### VIETNAM

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, news reports indicate that immediate consideration is being given to the resumption of bombing in North Vietnam; and if bombing in North Vietnam is resumed, a second question will follow quickly, whether to extend it to targets in Hanoi and Haiphong. This could, of course, mean the possible extension of the war in area, in time, and in casualties.

I appreciate and recognize the gravity of the decision the President will be called upon to make, and the heavy responsibilities he bears.

Mr. President, I was prepared to speak on these issues on January 10, when the Senate first met, but when the Senate recessed, I issued a statement outlining my position, based on a visit to Vietnam. Since January 10 I have been in the Far East again and in Vietnam. I have talked with Americans, allies, and neutrals.

The points I made in my statement on January 10, 16 days ago, have been strengthened, and I repeat them today.

The first that efforts toward negotiation should be continued. As I said before, negotiation, not escalation, should be the dominant theme of our activity.

The President's initiative for negotiations, pursued through able representatives, was one which we all commend, and they have had a deep effect on opinion in many countries. Perhaps they could be continued quietly in capitals in countries where the North Vietnamese have representatives, where soundings were made through our Ambassadors, and also perhaps through other representatives of this Nation, and through representatives of many nations which are concerned about extending the war.

My second point is that bombing should not be resumed now. If bombings are resumed we will lose, at least for the present, the chance to negotiate, however slim it is.

Although it would be an unfair judgment, it may discredit among other nations the President's efforts to bring about a negotiation.

Also, we should not judge the possibility of negotiation solely by Hanoi's recent public pronouncements. We must remember that the Communists did negotiate in 1954 over Vietnam and the Communist Pathet Lao did negotiate in 1962 about Laos. Agreements were not wholly satisfactory to the United States, but it is a fact that neither of these two nations are yet under Communist domination.

Surely if so many striving nations have expressed their support of a negotiated settlement in Vietnam their support can continue to exert some influence toward bringing Hanoi to reason.

My third point is that the President set out more clearly than before that the Vietcong could be included in proposed negotiations.

The Vietcong is supported in Vietnam with forces and supplies supplied by North Vietnam and by supplies from Communist China. But in the main they are the fighters we face.

This reality must be faced and distasteful as it is—it is obvious that negotiations or settlement are impossible or unlikely without their inclusion. We

should consider this reality and not be limited by the objections of some countries, including the South Vietnamese, are concerned as they are. A just, fair, and honestly negotiated settlement is our objective and it is, of course, the way of reason for South Vietnam and ourselves.

Another point that I made on January 10 is that after a ceasefire of specified duration, the people of Vietnam, both North and South should vote under the Geneva accords for a government it chooses. It is to be hoped, and I hope, that they vote for Saigon, but if they choose Hanoi it would be their choice and it would be because democratic values cannot be understood by their people.

If a ceasefire can be obtained for a period of time—3 to 5 years, or even less—it could be used by the United States and other concerned governments to engage fully and effectively in programs to develop the country's economy. These could include the proposed Mekong River project, health, education, and rural and administration programs.

The South Vietnamese and our Government are embarking now, and purposely, on such a program and with the help of other Democratic governments there would be the opportunity to show the people of Vietnam that a free system of government is best.

I recognize that there has been no favorable response to the efforts of the President. I know also that there is some risk to the security of our forces in the course that I recommend, although I do not believe it is as great a risk in the long run as the risk of now resuming or extending the bombing of North Vietnam.

The bombing of North Vietnam has not been very successful in preventing the movement of supplies into South Vietnam. With our military activity now directed to South Vietnam, I believe our strengthening forces are sufficient to insure their security, at least for a reasonable time, if the present level of military engagement does not escalate.

Finally the capacity of the United States to meet with any military eventuality is far greater than any enemy we face. This should not be doubted by them and should not be doubted at home. I know we may be forced to pursue military courses to insure a just settlement of the Vietnam problem. But I make these remarks in the hope that a continued effort will be made, at least for a reasonable time, toward the chance of negotiation, slim as that may seem.

If we are forced to pursue military courses, I know that we will stand together in the support of our country and I stand in support of our country as I always have.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the Record following my speech, the statement which I made on January 10.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR J. COOPER

The war in Vietnam is the overriding issue before our country. It will be and should be debated, and every fact sought out. And, in this process, the administration must provide every fact.

January 26, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1177

The refusal thus far of the Communist authorities to respond to the administration's initiative for negotiations is producing great pressures to extend the war militarily, first by renewed bombing of North Vietnam, and more specifically, the bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong. The present unwillingness of the Communists to negotiate, and the sad fact of increasing casualties makes these pressures inevitable.

Nevertheless, I believe it would be a mistake to cease efforts for negotiation, and particularly after the administration has made a worldwide appeal. Negotiation, not escalation, should be the dominant theme of our activity now.

We have a chance, admittedly not an encouraging one but perhaps the only one we will have for a time, to develop a set of steps toward negotiations and the just settlement of the war in Vietnam by peaceful means, rather than by a larger and bloodier war whose bounds we cannot foresee. We have an opportunity to continue efforts to influence the formation of a group of nations, either under the Geneva accords, or the United Nations, or outside these organizations, which would be willing to urge negotiations, to assist in their conduct, and to supervise and enforce any agreement that might be reached.

There is another reason for not broadening and intensifying the war now. Simply, it is that the logistic situation now defies any significant extension of the war and the maintenance at the same time of the security of our forces. The report of the group led by Senators MANSFIELD and AIKEN confirms this. It says: "The rapid infusion of American forces (into South Vietnam) has strained the facilities of the new logistic system to the utmost, with long delays in unloading and moving equipment not unusual. There have also been and still are shortages of important items of supply despite efforts to eliminate these shortages."

Although I spent only 1 day in Vietnam in December, simple observation and a comprehensive military briefing there—which from my experience in Europe in World War II, I recognized as a reliable "war briefing"—were proof to me that we have not yet developed the port facilities and air bases to adequately supply and protect our forces which have been so rapidly built up.

The pressures for escalation rest upon concerns that touch all of us—the assistance and protection of our forces, and the ending of the war. But to step up bombing now without adequate supply facilities, without taking into consideration the additional strains that would be placed on our facilities and supplies, if North Vietnamese troops in South Vietnam should be largely increased, could result in increased American and South Vietnamese casualties and a lengthened, rather than a shortened war.

Those who press for the immediate escalation of the war and a quick military solution should realize this most.

We may be forced to pursue the military course to insure a just settlement of the Vietnam problem and, if so, we will stand together in its support. But we should not plunge into it without consideration of all its consequences, and we should not slip or meander into it.

On March 25, 1965, I spoke in the Senate and urged that the President state that the United States was prepared to enter unconditionally into negotiations. I suggest today that the President make clear, without reservation, that negotiations could include the Vietcong, because it is obvious that neither negotiations nor a settlement are possible without their inclusion.

Perhaps the United States could propose a cease-fire of 3 to 5 years duration, supervised and enforced under the United Nations, at the end of which time the implementation

of the Geneva accords of 1954, with respect to elections, would be carried out.

During this cease-fire, interested governments could embark on programs of economic and agricultural development, including the proposed Mekong River project, as well as programs in the fields of health and education. A country, not a battlefield, could be built.

And, at the end of those years, the people could vote to unite under a government of their own choosing—Saigon, we hope; Hanoi if the appeal of democratic value cannot be understood by their people.

It may be that no settlement is possible without extended war. But we must remember that in 1954, after Dienbienphu, when nothing stood in the way of the Viet Minh conquest of all Vietnam, there were negotiations at Geneva. Again, in 1961 and 1962, when the situation in Laos seemed hopeless, the representatives of the Communist Pathet Lao went to the conference table. The settlements reached were not wholly agreeable to the United States—but the United States agreed to them—and Laos, Cambodia, and even South Vietnam are not under the control of the Communists.

Let us continue to make the effort toward negotiations while there is yet a little time and while there is yet a chance—slim as it may be. For a cease-fire, and a just settlement, ought to be for the Vietnamese and for us the solution that reason recommends.

#### PROPOSED REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a) (3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the basic issue in this debate is freedom. It involves several basic American freedoms, but primarily and fundamentally it involves that great concept of American freedom of association, our American freedom of an individual to earn his living in a vocation of his own choice, in an economic activity which is suited to his talents and his desires, and in a community where he desires to live and raise his family; and the concept that every American citizen has an equal right to enjoy those freedoms without having imposed upon him a license to work, or a requirement to pay a special tax or fee of any kind in order to support himself and his family.

There are times in the course of the country's history when the Members of this body are called upon to make decisions on legislation which can alter the very complexion of our Government and the entire way of life which prevails in the United States. Such decisions call for the most careful study, honest appraisal, and sincere soul searching. For if we err in our collective judgment, then we as Members of the U.S. Senate can do irreparable harm to this land which we love so much.

I am convinced that in this debate and in this decision we are facing that type of situation as we give consideration whether or not to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. The basic, fundamental, farflung ramifications of this legislation are far wider and deeper and more significant in import than the specific legal provisions involving right-to-work legislation in our respective States. Sometimes the issues that we are called upon to decide are complex.

It is not always easy to see which road is the right one. In the case of section 14(b), the issue that occurs to me is basically very simple, although the ramifications are very great. Some proponents of repeal of section 14(b) have gone to great lengths in their attempts to confuse the basic issue and shroud it in misunderstanding and misinformation. The Senate has been subjected to a veritable blizzard of propaganda aimed at convincing us that we should eliminate section 14(b)—that section of the Taft-Hartley Act which affirms the right to the States to enact right-to-work legislation.

To make the right decision, we must cut through all of the propaganda and get to the basic principles of this issue.

What are these principles that are the heart of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act? It seems to me there are two closely intertwined principles involved. One is the preservation of individual freedom—the issue to which I alluded as I began my remarks upon obtaining the floor—and the other issue is the preservation of the Constitution of the United States and the constitutions of our several States—and, for me, also the constitution of my home State of South Dakota.

The Constitution of the United States contains guarantees of freedom of association, freedom of assembly, and freedom of speech. What happens to these guarantees if men and women can be coerced into joining labor unions, or any other kind of organization, in order to work at their jobs to support their families? If section 14(b) should be repealed, each of these guarantees would be imperiled and part of the basic framework of our Constitution would be impaired. That could lead to further erosions and saturations in the years to come.

The right to work was declared to be a plain and self-evident principle of American constitutional law by Justice Charles Evans Hughes when he declared nearly 50 years ago:

It requires no argument to show that the right to work for a living in the common occupations of the community is the very essence of the personal freedom and opportunity that it was the purpose of the amendment to secure.

The amendment of which he spoke was the 14th, forbidding the Government to deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.

It seems to me that section 14(b) should have powerful appeal to all believers in democracy, for two reasons. First, because it accents the principle of voluntary action instead of coercion.

True democracies permit their people maximum freedom of action in their daily lives, while controlled societies compel and direct them by law. Second, the right of a man to earn his living free of all duress is the most basic of all civil rights. If a worker can be deprived of this basic right, then all others—including free speech and free assembly—are in peril as well.

Certainly, if a man cannot support his family, if he cannot find and accept a job, if he cannot find a position in which he can utilize his talents in order to earn the wherewithal to live, the other freedoms are of small moment to an unemployed or unemployable man starving because of the fact that he has been denied, by some act of legislation, the right to earn a living unless he does something which could be highly offensive and objectionable to him; namely, to pay a license or tribute in the form of an initiation and regular dues to an organization with which he has no sympathy, to an organization which he prefers to remain out of instead of to become a member of, or to an organization led by someone of whom he disapproves.

I happen to believe that he should have every right in the world to join that organization if he wishes to do so but, unless we may be entering some new era of economic slavery, I challenge the right of this Government, this body, or of any government, to compel a man, against his will, to pay tribute to a group of which he disapproves.

I believe that no one has that much power.

Good labor leaders do not need that kind of legislation. They attract—and properly so—the membership required to operate and organize the unions. Good labor leaders produce benefits for their workers, and men and women properly join and support such an organization which will be of benefit to them. Good labor leaders and good organizations do not need coercion and a government whip to drive workers into their membership.

Mr. President, why should we make this power available so that bad labor leaders and bad labor unions can coerce men and women into membership who otherwise would refuse to join?

Why put the power of the Government behind the activities of a dishonest labor leader who tends to discourage workers from joining his group because of his behavior?

Why put the strong arm of the Government in the hands of a disloyal labor leader who acts against the state and whose support of subversive causes repels men and women from membership, causing them to keep out?

Why put the strength of the Government behind lazy labor leaders who do nothing very much to promote the interests of their membership, who fatten themselves with the protective devices in their own jobs, who enjoy the luxury of the salaries they receive, who are indifferent to the needs of the workers, and who, on occasion, enter into sweetheart contracts with the employer?

Why give that kind of lazy, indifferent, inconsiderate labor leader the power of

the Government to compel the people around him, who do not wish to join his union, to pay dues and an initiation fee so that he can lead an easier, plusher, and even lazier life?

As I have stated, good labor leaders and good organizations, do not need this kind of thing.

Understandably, men and women join unions which are producing benefits for them, which will create better working conditions, and which will give them better security in their jobs.

Intelligent men and women, understandably, refuse to join labor organizations which do not produce.

Why should Congress—why should this Government—compel workers to join unions of which they disapprove, which they consider worthless, or which, in some instances, they might consider to be even objectionable?

I should like to mention also, Mr. President, some of the elements involved in the fundamental right of association which is guaranteed by the Constitution and protected by right-to-work laws. This freedom has both an affirmative and a negative side. It guarantees not only the right to join, also the right to refrain from joining any private organization or association.

At a later point in my speech, I intend to show that this has an important duality of application as it is applied in my own home State of South Dakota, where we have found it to be beneficial at times to the working man, as well as to the employer and the general public, because it gives the worker his American right of free choice.

Freedom of association springs from the right of each person to order his life according to his own wishes, to choose where he will work and what, if any, church, political party, lodge, club, or labor union he will join and support. Many working men and women want to join unions. I can understand that. I think I would want to join a union if I worked at a craft or if I were surrounded by union members or worked in a shop of vast size where I had little contact with my employer. I know I would want to join a union if it were well led, if it were an honest union, if I had a right to participate in directing its destiny, if I had the right of secret ballot. I suspect that many men and women want to join that kind of union, and in fact do join unions which are led in that way and under such rules and regulations. Nevertheless, we find a man or a woman who does not want to join even a good union, just as there are men and women who do not want to join a good church, or a good lodge, or a good club. Either way, those choices should be respected. We do not want politicians to push people around. The totalitarians, the Communists, the Fascists, give their politicians the right to tell the fellow in private life what he must do. But in America we respect the individual citizen and give him the right to join or not to join a union, the right to join or not to join a club, the right to join or not to join a lodge, and the right to be protected by the right-to-work provision which is contained in a constitu-

tion such as that of the State of South Dakota.

Let us remember that a union is something more than a collective bargaining representative. It is partly a political organization, partly a fraternal organization, partly a social club with a meeting or assembly hall, partly an insurance or pension organization or association or company.

Frequently a union aspires to be a state within a state and exercise a high degree of discipline and control over its members. None of these things are objectionable if membership is on a voluntary basis and if the union is democratically run, for if the membership is, in fact, on a voluntary basis it must be democratically operated, because there will be an escape hatch through which its disenchanted members can walk out of a dictatorial union. Once the escape hatch is closed, the dictatorial leaders will grow and obtain strength and stature.

These kinds of labor unions, under coercion, violate the fundamental principles set forth in our constitution to force a man to join any private organization which performs these functions, should he join a service club, a service organization, a church, or an insurance firm. All these have been incorporated in greater or less degree in unions of one type or other. But by one fell swoop we would compel to join those unions only people who work with their hands as artisans or craftsmen and let them lose freedoms which all the rest of our Americans enjoy, that our farmers enjoy, that our businessmen enjoy, that many other types of activity in the private sector enjoy.

What is so wrong about a craftsman or artisan earning a living that there should be an asterisk in the Constitution of the United States pointing out in a footnote at the bottom of a page that because one is working with his hands he can be compelled to go into a union by government duress?

That concept of freedom for an important segment of our population is 100 percent wrong, and I believe before this debate is over many Americans will agree, and, before this discussion ends, that the attempt will be defeated.

There is another, equally important way in which the repeal of section 14(b) would weaken the Constitution of the United States. It would be another step in the direction of taking away from the States the right to order their affairs, and placing all control in the hands of a centralized Government.

It would accentuate and expand a trend which I believe has already attained dangerous proportions in this country. This was not what our Constitution provided.

The Constitution provided for a balancing of State and Federal powers with certain powers given to the Federal Establishment and all others reserved to the States.

I have said many times that I think the unique American contribution in constitutional government around the world and the one most significant innovation we produced on the Western Hemisphere



January 26, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

H.R. 12319

A bill to amend section 4 of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C., section 15), and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes", approved October 15, 1914 (15 U.S.C., sec. 15), is hereby amended by inserting "(a)" after Section 4, and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) In any action pending or instituted under subsection (a) of this section on or after the date of enactment of this subsection, the amount recovered in excess of the damages sustained shall not be treated as income for purposes of any law of the United States imposing a tax on income. In any action pending or instituted under subsection (a) of this section or under section 4A of this Act on or after the date of enactment of this subsection, no payment made by any defendant pursuant to any judgment or settlement of such action shall be deductible as ordinary and necessary expense under any law of the United States imposing a tax on income."

### Representatives Cautioned To Watch Excesses of Commission on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

**HON. JAMES D. MARTIN**

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include a statement made before a meeting of the Associated Industries of Alabama on Monday during the annual Washington conference.

The following statement was made by Mr. James B. Brand, director of industrial relations, of James B. Clow & Sons, of Birmingham, Ala. Mr. Brand's statement deals fairly and honestly with the enforcement of the civil rights law of 1964 and the investigations conducted in Alabama by the Civil Rights Commission.

STATEMENT IN THE INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS FIELD, PRESENTED BEFORE THE ALABAMA CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION, JANUARY 24, 1966, BY JAMES B. BRAND

Subject: Equal employment opportunity, H.R. 10065.

In November and December 1965, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights held committee hearings in Birmingham, Mobile, and Huntsville on title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

Mr. Jacques E. Wilmore, director of the mid-South region, stated the findings of the committee indicated that major Alabama employers have taken title VII seriously and were complying within their capabilities. In fact, Alabama has done more than most States in this area.

Our association has distributed numerous bulletins explaining the responsibilities of employers and how they should go about complying with title VII. In addition, AIA has sponsored workshops on this subject throughout Alabama. We feel our efforts contributed to the favorable findings of the Civil Rights Commission.

Although the Civil Rights law of 1964 has

been effective for 7 months, a new law—H.R. 10065 (equal employment opportunity) has been reported by the House Education and Labor Committee.

Without going into minute details, I will point out some of the bill's salient features:

1. Upon enactment, any business which employs 100 or more would be covered; 50 or more on June 2, 1966, and 8 or more on June 2, 1967. A radical change from title VII.

2. This bill would allow the filing of a complaint based on an unlawful practice which occurred up to a period of 1 year prior to the filing of the charge—a substantial extension of the present legal 90-day statute of limitations. Facts surrounding an alleged discriminatory act could very easily be illusory after a 1-year period.

3. The Commission would have the authority to issue cease-and-desist orders and require action including reinstatement or hiring, with or without pay. Such orders could require the respondent to make reports periodically showing the extent to which he has complied.

4. The Commission could petition a circuit court of appeals or any appropriate district court for enforcement on its orders. Any findings of fact by the Commission, if supported by substantial evidence, would be conclusive and binding on the courts.

5. The bill directs the Commission to conduct a continuing survey of opportunity and other training programs to determine unlawful employment practices. The Commission would have access to any record maintained by the employers.

6. This bill would place a substantial measure of enforcement within the authority of the Commission, whereas until title VII the enforcement is in the hands of the Attorney General.

Gentlemen, it may well be that changes in the civil rights law of 1964 will be necessary, but this bill is not the answer. We agree with Representative GLENN ANDREWS who stated: "This bill is ill-timed and unnecessary."

We call on you today to study carefully the far-reaching effects H.R. 10065 will have on Alabama employers, labor organizations, or joint labor management committees. The fact that title VII has been in effect only 7 months indicates the prematurity of such action. Employers are complying with "good intent." The Commission is just beginning to function, and any further legislation could very easily impede desired compliance.

We are confident that your decision will be that this bill is not in the best interest of the people of Alabama.

#### PRESENT TITLE VII PROBLEMS

We, in AIA, would like to request that you, our Representatives, watch carefully those investigative activities of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, whereby representatives of this Commission "read into" title VII requirements over and above those as set out by the law—specifically requesting the placement of women into impractical job positions and in investigating "group general" complaints instead of specific charges.

### REA Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. E. Y. BERRY**

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the President's budget for fiscal 1967, recommend-

ing a reduction of \$435 million from the \$672 million REA Director Norman M. Clapp had requested, is not only serious, but at the same time the President has impounded \$132 million presently unspent but seriously needed by REA for 1966.

This is no time to cripple REA when communication lines and extensions are urgently needed to provide electrical distribution to the farms of South Dakota and the Nation.

If the administration were actually making this cut in an effort to economize, then I would recommend that we tighten our belts and go along, but while he is cutting the heart out of REA and the farmer generally, he is asking for millions to pay the rent for city dwellers whose incomes vastly exceed the annual incomes of most farmers.

I shall continue to fight to help bring the farm standard of living up to somewhere near the standard of those the President would subsidize with rent payments from the Federal Treasury.

### Globe-Democrat Publisher Speaks on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. DURWARD G. HALL**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Richard H. Amberg, the outstanding editor and publisher of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, spoke recently on developments in Vietnam, before the meeting of the American Association of University Women in Springfield, Mo.

Mr. Amberg's remarks were carried in the Drury College Mirror, of Springfield, Mo., and because they are so pertinent to the present situation, I ask unanimous consent to insert the article at this point in the RECORD:

VIETNAM IS TOPIC OF TRUSTEE'S TALK

(By Scott Chalmers)

Richard H. Amberg, editor and publisher of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat since 1955, and a member of the board of trustees of Drury College, spoke on developments in Vietnam Wednesday night at the annual joint meeting of the University Club and the American Association of University Women. The meeting was held in the VIP Room at the Lamplighter Motor Hotel.

In his speech Amberg advocated that the United States should continue and strengthen its policy in Vietnam. He condemned past policy of this country's leaders, including President Johnson and his position of a few months ago, which he said was to refuse to take a positive and determined stand as to what this country was going to do in Vietnam.

Amberg said, "We have three alternatives: pull out entirely, negotiate, or win the war." He pointed out the troubled situation and precarious geographical location in which Vietnam is situated.

Red China immediately to the north and the revolutionary unrest present in Indonesia located to the south, combine to put Vietnam in a critical position overlooking

A356

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

January 26, 1966

the important Malacca Straits that are the vital supply routes for virtually all of south-east Asia, he explained.

From these facts he pointed out that a fatal mistake that could result if we pulled out, letting down our few friends in this area of the world and leaving it vulnerable to Communist domination.

Since there is really no government to negotiate with and since they negotiate only by requesting that we "get out," the reasonable alternative is to "win the war."

By win the war Amberg declares that we should take a stand and fight for total victory or "at least until we can negotiate on reasonable terms."

To do this he said we need to go ahead and blockade ocean supply routes, bomb missile sites and Hanoi, where industrial supply complexes are centered. He also called it, "Immoral for our friends such as Canada to sell wheat to Red China, freeing laborers to work in arms factories, which supply the Vietcong."

He stated that "to be successful you need to be strong." Historically speaking he noted that history is on the side of countries that think there is salvation in strength. "To win," he said, "we must have the determined will to win."

Mr. Amberg does not advocate a wider war effort that would extend into North Vietnam. He wants the United States to only secure South Vietnam, where our commitments lie and perhaps use air strikes north of the 17th parallel to sever supply routes to the south. "Let North Vietnam do what it wants."

Mr. Amberg and the paper he heads both are determined battlers against Communist elements. While not calling any of the anti-Vietnam demonstrations Communist inspired, he called them actions that indirectly "prolong the war, and add fuel to anti-U.S. propaganda machines."

Although the Wednesday night audience's applause voiced their agreement with his views on the developments in Vietnam, he and the Globe-Democrat recently came under fire from Washington University's newspaper, Student Life.

On the front page of the Globe, a story linked Theodore Rosebury, professor of bacteriology in the Washington University Dental School with "Communist infiltrated and exploited teach-ins."

Amid exchanges of front page editorials and stories in the Student Life, Amberg stated that, "In all fairness I do not feel that our faithful reporting of the news and our criticism of disgraceful Communist tactics, whether they apply to Aptheker, one of the leading Communists in the country, Rosebury \* \* \* or the criticism of American foreign policy by fringe student groups or by university professors, warrants the description used of this great newspaper, (Globe), by Randy Flachsbar, editor in chief of Student Life, even by a juvenile."

### Changes in Public Laws 815 and 874

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which would amend Public Laws 815 and 874 in order to bring them more in line with their original purpose.

These laws had their genesis in late 1949 and early 1950 when the Subcom-

mittee on Education of the House Education and Labor Committee conducted extensive hearings all across the country, the printed record of which extends to some 2,400 pages. In the report of that committee, it was stated that—

Federal assistance as called for in these recommendations is restricted to meeting the Federal responsibility only in these affected school districts; it is not intended to provide assistance that would be available under proposals for general Federal aid.

Over the years since 1950, however, due largely to various amendments, the program has become a kind of general aid to education, "under a poor formula" as one authority put it. While I would be opposed on principle to a Federal program of general aid to education, if we are to have such a program it should be drawn up, introduced, and debated on its own merits. It should not be foisted off on this Congress and on the public by hacking up, amending, and distorting a bill designed to meet a limited and specific problem. It is with an eye toward eliminating some of the more serious inequities and unjustifiable provisions of these laws that I am proposing the following changes.

#### ELIMINATE ONE-HALF OF NATIONAL AVERAGE CONTRIBUTION RATE

First of all, my bill would eliminate the one-half of national contribution rate as an alternative basis for computing the "local contribution rate." At present, the local school district can use as its "local contribution rate" any one of three different figures—the amount spent per pupil from local revenue sources in "generally comparable" school districts within the State, one-half of the State average per pupil cost, or one-half of the national average per pupil cost in the continental United States.

This latter alternative should be eliminated since—

Such a rate bears no reasonable relation to the revenue losses or financial burdens occasioned for a particular school district by Federal property tax exemption. Its effect, indeed, is a Federal payment of the full cost per "A" category pupil to many school districts which receive in addition substantial State aid for these same pupils. (Statement of Francis Keppel, Commissioner of Education before the Select Subcommittee on Education, House Committee on Education and Labor, Apr. 2, 1963.)

The original purpose behind the one-half of national average contribution rate was to make the payments to school districts throughout the Nation more nearly equal. Before the amendment, there was a very wide discrepancy among payments to school districts in different States. This was due to the fact that Federal payments were based on local contribution rates, and in States where the State contribution to education was high, the local rates were low, and vice versa. It was felt by many to be inequitable for a State which contributed highly to education to be penalized by the terms of the act. Again, however, the present act is being confused with a program of general Federal aid to education.

As was said by Elliot L. Richardson, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1958:

The relevant measure is that amount which will put the school district in the same situation as other school districts in the State.

The purpose of Public Laws 815 and 874 is to alleviate the burden caused by Federal activities; its purpose is not to equalize the quality of American education or to provide a gratuitous boon to fortunate school districts. This amendment would save \$17 billion.

#### REDUCTION OF PAYMENTS FOR 3(b) "OUT" CHILDREN

The second change would provide that, in a situation where the parents work on tax-exempt Federal property but live in a school district other than the district in which the property is located, payment for each child would be reduced from 50 to 25 percent of the local contribution rate. Under the existing laws, all "B" category pupils are compensated for at the 50-percent rate, whether the Federal property is located within or without the district of residence. Yet, it is obvious that the burden is greater in the one case than in the other.

When both the Federal property and the residence are in the same school district—the B "in" pupils—school revenue per "B" pupil is cut one-half by reason of the Federal property tax exemption—retaining the other one-half which comes from the residential property. On the other hand, when the Federal property is located outside the district of residence, there is no reduction due to Federal tax exemption. In many States, however, the contribution to local school districts from State tax funds is fairly substantial. Tax-exempt Federal property located anywhere in the State would reduce this State contribution to the local district. To compensate for this reduction, this bill does not entirely eliminate payments for B "out" pupils, but rather provides that they will be compensated for at a rate of 25 percent of the local contribution rate.

In addition, if payments were reduced when the Federal installation is not in the school district, there would be an incentive to consolidate school districts, a procedure generally supported by educators and others who have concerned themselves with the problems of the American school system. This amendment would save \$52,411,662.

#### THREE-PERCENT ABSORPTION REQUIREMENT

A third change would revive the 3-percent absorption requirement. In Public Law 874, as it stood in 1951, it was provided that the school district should absorb a number of federally connected students equal to 3 percent of average daily attendance, the theory being that the Federal installation brings certain benefits to the district which should offset to a certain extent the burden caused by the federally connected pupils. Implementation of this provision was postponed for a year in order to give the local school districts time to prepare for its effects. Yet, when it came time to put this section of the law into effect, the opposition of school district superintendents throughout the country was loud and vocal, since it would, of course, cut down, or in some cases eliminate, their allotment. As a result, the provision was again postponed and eventually elimi-

January 26, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A357

nated. In its place, it was provided that there should be a 3-percent eligibility rather than an absorption requirement. Thus, a school district would receive payment for all federally connected pupils as soon as their number reached 3 percent of all pupils in average daily attendance. This provision is both inequitable in its effect and unjustifiable in terms of the original purpose of the laws. It is inequitable in that a district which has 3 percent federally connected pupils is compensated for all of them, while a district with 2.99 percent receives no help at all. What has been done, in effect, is to eliminate the absorption requirement in some cases and retain it in others. If the absorption requirement were revived, this inequitable situation would be remedied.

The provision is unjustifiable, since it fails to take into account the benefits which a Federal installation brings to a community. In the words of M. L. Reese, county manager, Montgomery County, Md., testifying in 1958 before the Subcommittee on Education of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

The loss of assessable base resulting from incoming Federal installations is, to a great extent, offset by a general tendency of stimulation to local commerce and area property values.

Reviving the 3 percent absorption requirement would recognize these benefits. This amendment would save \$44,111,023.

ELIMINATION OF PAYMENTS UNDER PUBLIC LAW 874 WHEN PRESCRIBED ELIGIBILITY CONDITIONS ARE NOT MET

A further provision of my bill would eliminate the so-called Purtell amendment. This amendment, approved in 1958, provided that a school district that has met the 3 percent—or 6 percent—eligibility requirement in any year but fails to meet the requirement in the next 2 succeeding years is still eligible for payment for the actual number of federally connected children in average daily attendance in the school district the first year, and for 50 percent of such payment the second year. This is designed to lessen the strain on the school budget which would result from a sudden elimination of Federal funds. With a 3-percent absorption requirement substituted for the present 3-percent eligibility requirement, such a phasing out would, of course, no longer be necessary. The school district would only be receiving payments for those students in excess of 3 percent, not for all students or for none as at present.

Yet, even if the 3-percent eligibility requirement were to be continued, the Purtell amendment could not be justified. According to L. G. Derthick, Commissioner of Education, testifying on June 9, 1959, before the Subcommittee on Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor:

This amendment is manifestly discriminatory as respects a school district which barely meets the 3-percent condition of eligibility in a given year and barely fails to meet that condition in a subsequent year, as against another school district which barely fails to meet such eligibility condition in either year.

Furthermore:

Such phasing out of Federal payment is unnecessary since Section 3(f) of the law

permits a 1-year continuance of payments in the case of a decrease in the number of Federally-connected children for which a school district had reasonably prepared in anticipation of eligibility for Federal payment when such decrease is due to a cessation in Federal activities. (Statement of Francis Keppel, Commissioner of Education, before the Select Subcommittee on Education, House Committee on Education and Labor, Apr. 2, 1963.)

Thus, the Federal Government would aid the local school district only when the need is a direct Federal responsibility. Again, it should be remembered that this is not a general Federal aid to education program based on need, but, rather, it is a limited program to fulfill a specific Federal responsibility. This amendment would save \$528,467.

#### TO PREVENT THE REDUCTION OF STATE PAYMENT TO IMPACTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Finally, there are a number of States that reduce the local school district's entitlement from State funds when these local districts receive aid under the impacted areas program. The State of California is the best example of this. Under California law, 60 percent of the funds received by the local school districts under Public Law 874 are considered to be local resources. Since the State contribution to the local school district is based on the local resources of the district, this provision has the effect of cutting down the State contribution to the local district by an amount equal to 60 percent of their entitlement under Public Law 874. As a result, the Federal Government is not only aiding the impacted school district, but may be providing a form of general aid to education in the State if the State funds that would have been available to the impacted school districts, if they had received no Federal payments, are used for other education purposes in the State.

My bill provides that Public Law 874 payments to the local school district are to be reduced by an amount equal to the reduction in the State entitlement. The State would thus be deterred from reducing its payment to federally impacted school districts.

I firmly believe that if these changes in the impacted areas legislation are adopted, a long step will have been taken toward making these laws both more equitable and more in line with their original purpose.

### On Being Serious

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted this morning to read in the January 26 issue of the Washington Post Mr. Joseph Alsop's column sent from Saigon. He so clearly points out the possible increase of sacrifices which our servicemen will undergo as a result of the buildup, both in personnel and materiel, which the North Vietnamese have

been able to accomplish during the cessation of bombing. It is almost unbelievable that those conducting the war in South Vietnam would knowingly fail to give our servicemen every possible protection available to this country. I hope this on-the-spot advice will be read by those who seem to feel that this country is not duty-bound to see that our servicemen are protected from every offensive move by the enemy. His column follows:

ON BEING SERIOUS

(By Joseph Alsop)

SAIGON.—From the perspective of Saigon, the noisy month of the President's peace offensive seems a very strange interlude indeed.

Before this reporter left for Vietnam, it had already begun to be hinted here and there in Washington that the peace offensive had been launched in the face of expert warnings that it was likely to do far more harm than good in both North and South Vietnam. This was certainly the case.

Furthermore, the outcome has justified the experts, for much harm has quite visibly been done. Here in the South, in the center of the war effort, dismay, uncertainty and doubt have been implanted.

The South Vietnamese Government was not consulted—indeed, it was hardly informed in advance—about the President's vast venture in mass diplomacy. The neglect of consultation, of course, increased the impact. All sorts of questions were raised, on every side, about the U.S. Government's strength of will and sternness of resolution.

When such questions are asked in South Vietnam, the result is always the same. Instability immediately sets in, and in the spirit of devil-take-the-hindmost, this group or that begins scheming for an antigovernmental group. Thus the promising government, which has maintained stability for the first time since the death of Ngo Dinh Diem, was momentarily endangered.

Fortunately the military directorate, the real core of the government, did not lose its unity. The coup impulse was only felt among certain officers of lower rank. If anything had been attempted, it would not have succeeded. But even the mere attempt would have been deeply, almost irreparably demoralizing.

As it was, the attempt was probably averted only by the calming and reassuring visit of Secretary of State Dean Rusk, which resulted from the infuriated protests about lack of consultation by the Vietnamese Ambassador in Washington, plus the accident of the tragic death of Prime Minister Shastri, of India. This was what lay behind Premier Nguyen Cao Ky's recent dark references to dissident officers.

It was going pretty far, to risk this kind of quite foreseeable trouble in South Vietnam. The risk might have been justified by a real gain in North Vietnam. But the loss in the north has been more grave, by a wide margin, than the loss in the south.

On the one hand, there is the practical loss. Almost without cease since last March, at great peril and cost to the pilots doing the job, the lines of communication in North Vietnam have been hammered by American air attacks. The effects were never so great as the White House and Pentagon sometimes claimed. But by the end of November, the cumulative effect was still very great indeed.

By sheer accumulation of damage and disruption of internal communication and steadily mounting demands for manpower for urgent repairs, the bombing was at last beginning to exert heavy pressure on the whole northern structure. The pause for the peace offensive has allowed all the worst damage to be repaired, new defenses to be



moved into place, and huge forward stockpiles to be built up for added pressure on the South. Thus most of the fruits of the hard effort of the last 8 months have now been thrown away.

Worse still, however, has been what may be called the morale loss in the North. It is a truism that just as the South Vietnamese build their hopes on confidence in America's strength of will, so the North Vietnamese build all their hopes on the belief that America lacks the strength of will to survive the present test. Every Vietnamese expert in the service of the U.S. Government agrees on this point.

Every sign indicates that the peace offensive has strongly bolstered this North Vietnamese belief that they can count on victory in the end, because the United States is basically weak willed.

To be sure, this strange episode is not yet at an end. But it can be predicted with confidence that the North Vietnamese will not negotiate, unless they are secretly assured that the United States will come to the conference table on terms amounting to surrender in advance of the conference.

The North Vietnamese have publicly said as much, in the most unvarnished language. And their main response to the peace offensive has been to push into South Vietnam, with much aid from the bombing pause, more and more of North Vietnamese regular troops. So many are now present in the South that they add up to a major invasion.

It is said, of course, that all the President's senior advisers concurred in the peace offensive, no doubt on domestic political and world opinion grounds in view of the all too accurate expert warnings above noted. But when the country is at war with 200,000 troops in the field, the only serious consideration should be the gains and losses in the war. And as far as the war is concerned, the balance sheet shows no gain and much loss.

### School Appropriation

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. E. Y. BERRY**

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, for the current fiscal year, it is estimated that from \$400 to \$415 million will be needed to meet all school districts' entitlement. Yet budget figures released Monday called for the appropriation of \$183 million to be used during fiscal 1967 for the operation of school districts with students whose parents work on or live on Government installations.

This slash in funds for operation of the federally impacted school program is unjustified, inequitable, and a breach of promise on the part of the Federal Government. It indicates the problems we can anticipate as the Federal Government moves further toward taking over the financing of our schools.

This cut of more than 50 percent will leave many South Dakota school districts far short of necessary funds—funds they had been led to believe they would receive and had included in their budget estimates. They simply had not taken into account the fact that they are

at the mercy of the all-powerful centralized Government in Washington whose whim it is to cut these essential funds to make room for more popular programs in this election year.

### A Salute to India

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. ADAM C. POWELL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today is a great day in the world, for the Republic of India celebrates the 16th anniversary of her independence. It is a great day in India because the promise of new leadership, in the person of Mrs. Indira Gandhi, India's new Prime Minister, hopefully will lead this magnificent country into the future with her head held high, full of confidence and enthusiasm.

This is an opportune time, therefore, Mr. Speaker, for us here to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency Dr. Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan, President of the Republic of India; to Her Excellency Mrs. Indira Gandhi, India's Prime Minister; and to His Excellency Braj Kumar Nehru, India's Ambassador to the United States.

Upon the shoulders of Mrs. Gandhi have fallen some weighty problems, but her faith in her country and her countrymen will give her the wisdom and guidance she will need to lead this great nation in these times. Our hopes and prayers go out to Mrs. Gandhi at this time. She follows in the illustrious footsteps of the late Prime Minister Shastri—but she, we are sure, will be able to continue the good work of this great man.

We join with our Indian brothers today in commemoration of a landmark in their political history—January 26, 1950, the day upon which the constitution of a free and independent India went into effect. That event marked the establishment of India as a Sovereign Democratic Republic, consisting of a Union of States. It represented a triumph for dedicated Indians who were determined to create a secular democracy in which every person would have the essentials of a decent government and in which inequalities would be reduced to a minimum.

Like our own Bill of Rights, the Indian Constitution named and guaranteed the basic rights of every citizen. It gave the right to vote to everyone 21 years of age and older. The constitution prohibited unequal treatment because of race, religion, social class, sex, or place of birth.

The 16 years that have passed since the Proclamation of the Republic have been as but an instant in the rich history of this 5,000-year-old land. In this period India has grappled heroically with mammoth difficulties. Extreme loyalties of religion and community have been divisive forces, impeding the coalescence of a strong national unity. The Indian economy has been beset with countless

problems, in particular the inability to produce enough food for her 465 million people. The ravages of heart-rending poverty, illiteracy, and disease have been etched upon the face of India. The threat of further aggression by the Communist Chinese has added yet another obstacle to the tremendous task of achieving economic self-sufficiency.

Despite these great handicaps, the cumulative effect has been to produce relatively minor distortions in Indian democracy. India today can boast a vigorous press, free trade unions, a growing number of articulate intellectuals, and growing national unity. The ideals of the constitution have been held in reverence, and, more important, have been translated into meaningful action. Having just passed through the crucible of the loss of the great leader Lal Bahadur Shastri, India has again proved the mettle of its democratic system.

Today in this new year of 1966 the democratic way of life stands threatened by Communist aggression. We here in America may take comfort in viewing India as one nation of the vast and teeming Asian land mass that shines forth as a major functioning democracy. To this great land, Mr. Speaker, we send our congratulations and best wishes.

### A Time of Bitterness

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, sometimes it seems to me that the people of this Nation, and especially the demonstrators against the American policy, or any policy, in Vietnam do not appreciate this Nation's responsibilities to their country.

It has been my experience that the one group of individuals who are absolutely convinced as to the importance of our mission there are the servicemen, who are facing death daily in an effort to preserve freedom for a small part of the world. I believe the following taken from the Chico-Enterprise Record of January 18, 1966, speaks for itself:

An American serviceman in Vietnam can be excused for being confused about how Americans at home feel about the war. He doesn't like being there in the first place so he is understandably bitter about the anti-Vietnam demonstrations in the United States.

That bitterness is apparent in a poem received recently by Mr. and Mrs. T. L. Arnold of Chico from their Marine Corps son, Hospital Corpsman Lee V. Arnold, who has seen duty in Vietnam but who, at last report, was being treated on Guam for malaria.

The Enterprise-Record doesn't usually print poetry, leaving that to the poetry magazines whose editors are much better judges of poetry than we are. However, feeling expressed in this poem—not the quality of the poetry—prompts us to make an exception to our no-poetry policy.

A360

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

January 26, 1966

EXPANDED UNION PRIVILEGES WILL TEND TOWARD A POWER STRUCTURE THAT WILL SURELY CURTAIL THE PERSONAL FREEDOMS OF ALL AMERICANS

What are the union leaders really after—complete domination of the political, social, and economic life of this Nation? If this is true, repeal of 14(b) will greatly enhance their position of dominance.

Dominance of the several branches of our Federal Government could ultimately bring the administration to the position of "house-keeper" for the AFL-CIO Executive Council.

## CONCLUSION

And in conclusion speaking for the Associated Industries of Alabama and a vast majority of Alabama citizens, we are calling on you, Senator HILL and Senator SPARKMAN, and the entire Alabama delegation to continue your efforts in any extended discussion of H.R. 77 to insure the retention of section 14(b).

## In Search of a Solution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following article by Mr. Walter Lippmann which appeared in the Washington Post on Monday, January 24, 1966:

WELL, WHAT CAN HE DO?

(By Walter Lippmann)

The reason why the peace offensive failed is most cogently revealed in the Mansfield report on the state of the war. Mr. Johnson has been trying to obtain by propaganda the victory which he has not been able to obtain on the battlefield—that is to say, the acceptance in the whole of South Vietnam of a government which has lost control of a very large part of South Vietnam. The peace offensive was bound to fail, and the grave decisions which the President hoped to circumvent and avoid are now before him.

If he is to make these decisions wisely, he must recognize that in international politics peace settlements are possible only as and when they reflect the real balance of power. In the World War, for example, Churchill and Roosevelt had to settle with Stalin for a Soviet political frontier in the midst of Germany and of Europe. That is where the Red army had arrived when the peace negotiations began. The same principle will hold in Vietnam. There will be no settlement until the terms of peace reflect the military reality.

The President will be disappointed again and again as long as he and Secretary Rusk ask for a settlement which in effect demands that the defeat of the Saigon forces be transmuted at the conference table into a victory for the Saigon forces. Nor should he indulge in any illusion that the informed opinion of mankind really thinks as Secretary Rusk talks merely because American envoys have been politely and sympathetically received in so many capitals.

What then should the President do? It is often said by the President's supporters that his critics propose no alternative to what he is doing. If that was ever true, it is no longer true today. It is not true since the Mansfield report and since the Gavin statement. The President should reduce his

war aims, which today are impossibly high in the light of the conditions described in the Mansfield report. He should alter his strategy along the lines proposed by General Gavin, making it a holding operation pending the eventual negotiation of a political settlement.

The Mansfield report shows that Mr. Rusk's objective—the rule of General Ky or his successor over the whole of South Vietnam—is unattainable no matter how much the war is escalated. The burden of disproving the conclusions of the Mansfield report is on those who have been proved wrong about the escalation of last summer, on those who are now asking for another escalation in order to redeem their failure, on those who want to redouble the stakes in order to recoup their losses.

If the Mansfield report contains the truth of the matter, it follows inevitably that our war aims should be reduced and our strategy revised. We should put aside the hopeless task of searching out and destroying the Vietcong, and we should take our stand, as General Gavin advises, on a holding operation in the coastal cities.

This is not a policy for a glorious victory or for some kind of dazzling political triumph. It is no trick for pulling rabbits out of a hat. It is a formula for liquidating a mistake, for ending a war that cannot be won at any tolerable price, for cutting our losses before they escalate into bankruptcy, and for listening to commonsense rather than to war whoops and tom-toms.

Because we are neither omniscient nor omnipotent, we, even we Americans, cannot always win. But I cannot help feeling in my bones that a display of commonsense by a proud and imperious nation would be a good moral investment for the future.

## John Watts Day, Fine Idea

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHELF

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, January 24, a JOHN WATTS Appreciation Day lunch, sponsored by the Lexington-Fayette County Chamber of Commerce, was given in Lexington, Ky.

Upon this occasion, all of the Members of the Kentucky delegation in the House, Republicans and Democrats alike, sent a joint wire of congratulations and warm good wishes to our highly esteemed colleague, JOHN WATTS, as a way of expressing our own appreciation for his magnificent contribution of distinguished service to his district, the State of Kentucky, and the Nation.

It is a pleasure to include an editorial entitled "JOHN WATTS Day, Fine Idea" from the Lexington Herald, Lexington, Ky.:

## JOHN WATTS DAY FINE IDEA

The Lexington-Fayette County Chamber of Commerce has come up with an excellent idea in planning an "Appreciation Day for Congressman JOHN C. WATTS." No Kentucky Representative in recent years is more deserving of this fine tribute to his work in behalf of his district, his State, and his country.

Representative WATTS first went to Washington as the Representative of the Sixth

District after winning a special election in April 1951, and has been reelected every 2 years since then. He is an A.B. and law college graduate of the University of Kentucky and is a farmer and banker in Jessamine County. He is perhaps better informed on burley tobacco than any member of either House of Congress and has been recognized for his wide interests in legislation by being named to the all-important Committee on Ways and Means, perhaps the top assignment for the House. He got early legislative training in the Kentucky Legislature where he served at one time as floor leader for his party.

While he has been identified with the Democratic Party during his political life, Representative WATTS has served all interests and both parties in Washington. He is elected and reelected by the votes of members of both parties and this fact is recognized in the nonpartisan promotion of the testimonial dinner that will be held on January 24. Advance ticket sales attest the great popularity of the Sixth District's Representative and a sellout of accommodations for the 1,000-seat Phoenix convention hall seems assured at this early date.

Representative WATTS always finds time to attend to the requests of his constituents. He reflects in his voting the opinions of the people who send him to Washington. Too often voters fail to tell their representatives how well they are doing and this testimonial luncheon will let Representative WATTS know that the voters of this district appreciate what he has done and is continuing to do to make this a great country. The chamber of commerce is to be congratulated on its idea.

## Half a War

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, it rarely happens that the Washington Post editorially criticizes this administration and I was quite surprised to read the leading editorial in the January 26 issue. It appears that even the Post can see through the thinly veiled misrepresentations in the budget message. I am delighted that they have called attention to this procedure to their readers. The editorial follows:

## HALF A WAR

President Johnson's new budget for the war on poverty is a disappointment to hopes that the President himself has raised. It represents a sharp cut in the plans that the Johnson administration itself had held before cities throughout the country, and a drastic reduction in the goals that the President in his own speeches has enunciated to the Nation.

The new budget can be said to expand the war on poverty only in a narrow and misleading sense. The Office of Economic Opportunity says that it will actually spend \$1.2 billion in the current fiscal year, but will spend \$1.7 billion in the next fiscal year. It is an increase of nearly 40 percent; is it not?

Unfortunately, this kind of arithmetic conceals the reality of the broad and powerful programs that Mr. Johnson has begun to create. Most of these programs have begun actual operation only since the beginning of this fiscal year, last July 1. Since they were spending next to nothing at the beginning

January 26, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A359

The poem is entitled "Who Is He."  
 "You sit at home and watch TV.  
 You're sipping a refreshing, cold iced tea.  
 The news comes on and then you hear  
 The All-Star game is drawing near.  
 Then you see a far-off land  
 Where men are dying in the sand.  
 A frown appears across your face,  
 You're tired of hearing about that place.  
 Who cares about Vietnam across the sea,  
 It's far away and it doesn't concern me.  
 You'd rather hear the Beatles play  
 Than learn about the world today.  
 But stop and think for a moment or two,  
 And ask yourself, 'Does this concern you?'  
 It's great to be alive and free.  
 But how about that guy across the sea?  
 He's giving up his life for me.  
 So that I can live under liberty.  
 He's far away to fight a war  
 Instead of fighting it at my front door.  
 This guy who lives in filth and slime,  
 How can he do it all the time?"

"He's about my age so why should he care  
 About a war someone else should share.  
 You call him names and make fun of his  
 cause  
 Yet he's always the first to go and win your  
 wars.  
 You lucky guy, you just laugh and sneer  
 Because you've never known fear.  
 But this brave man faces death each day.  
 Yet he's always got something funny to say."

"No mail again, a twinge of sorrow,  
 Oh what the heck; there's always tomorrow.  
 The morale is low and the tension is high,  
 Some men even break down and cry.  
 He wants to go home to see a loved one  
 But he won't until he gets the job done.  
 He works all day and stands guard all night,  
 He's tired and sick but he continues to fight."

"The college crowd thinks he's a fool,  
 But that is what makes him so hard and  
 cruel.  
 You don't appreciate the things he will do  
 Like giving up his life for you.  
 He sacrifices much, yet asks no return,  
 Just so you can stay in school and learn.  
 He believes in freedom and the American  
 way of life.  
 He'd rather die than live a Communist life."

"No parties and dances for this brave young  
 man,  
 Until he comes back home again.  
 The days are hot and the nights too,  
 What wonders a cold can of beer can do.  
 He dreams of cold beer and a thick, juicy  
 steak,  
 Then someone shouts, 'We've got a hill to  
 take!'  
 Some will be heroes, because they are brave,  
 And others will just get a wreath on their  
 grave."

"You'll recognize him when he walks by,  
 There's a saddened look within his eyes.  
 He walks so proud, yet looks so mean.  
 He's called the world's greatest fighting  
 machine;  
 No wonder he's proud; he's a U.S. Marine."

### Associated Industries of Alabama Take Stand on Retention of 14(b)

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, this week the Associated Industries

of Alabama held its annual Washington meeting. The entire Alabama congressional delegation was privileged to meet with these representatives of the great industries in Alabama and to hear their views on pending legislation. I would like to share some thinking of these keymen in Alabama industry with all the Members of Congress. Following is a statement by Mr. Frank Mattox, southern division manager, of Arvin Industries, Inc., from Fayette, Ala. Mr. Mattox sets forth in clear and understandable language the position of the association on the proposed repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

I am especially proud to begin this series with the statement by Mr. Mattox because Fayette is one of the fine communities in the Seventh District of Alabama, the district I have the high honor to represent. Arvin Industries is contributing greatly to the economy of the district and the State, thereby helping all the people. Mr. Mattox's statement follows:

STATEMENT IN THE INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS FIELD, PRESENTED BEFORE THE ALABAMA CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION, JANUARY 24, 1966, BY FRANK MATTOX

Subject: Retention of section 14(b), National Labor Relations Act.

On behalf of Associated Industries of Alabama's 987 member companies and numerous citizens of Alabama, I congratulate each of our Representatives on his vote to retain section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act.

To you, Senator HILL and Senator SPARKMAN, we are indebted for your active participation in the extended discussion held on this subject and your vote against cloture just prior to adjournment of the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

The Associated Industries of Alabama believes that the natural and inalienable right of every person to exercise freedom of choice should be vigorously protected by the agents and agencies of Government at every level of authority.

To assure this freedom of choice, AIA has continuously urged retention of section 14(b) as a part of the Taft-Hartley Act. The following thoughts in support of retention are offered.

REPEAL OF 14(b) WOULD OPEN THE DOOR TO DISCRIMINATION OF THE WORST SORT

This is inconsistent with our Nation's efforts to wipe out discrimination. Is not the administration putting itself in the paradoxical position of sponsoring discrimination against a person in violation of section 8(a) (3) which forbids an employer to discriminate in employment so as to encourage or discourage membership in a labor union?

Is not the administration's effort to repeal 14(b) in conflict with the antidiscrimination principle of this Nation as expressed in title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964?

We submit that the enactment of repeal legislation would place the Federal Government in the situation of switching its position from one of antidiscrimination to one of discrimination against the worker in his employment situation.

THE UNIONS USE THE VERY QUESTIONABLE "FREE-RIDER" ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF REPEAL OF 14(b)

This argument seems to be inconsistent because of the fact that the unions eagerly sought and pressured for the privilege to represent all employees in an appropriate bargaining unit, regardless of the wishes of

the minority employees, who are, in reality, "unwilling passengers."

Why should the unions be given a second big privilege because of their complaint with their first big privilege? Would it not be the better part of wisdom for them to seek changes in Taft-Hartley that would require them to represent only their bargaining-unit members?

THE UNION'S CLAIM THAT RIGHT TO WORK IMPEDES PROGRESS AND PROMOTES LOW WAGES IS OF DUBIOUS VALIDITY

The Bureau of Labor Statistics and other nationally recognized reports show that, in the 10-year period from 1953 to 1963, 3 right-to-work States led the Nation in the rate of new jobs created in business and industry, and that 3 of the top 5 and 7 of the top 10 States in the Nation in rate of gain in manufacturing hourly wage rates were right-to-work States.

Too, isn't it a fact that wages, to a very great degree, are a function of productivity and capital investment, and thus tend to be highest where such investment has been most intense? Regional differences in wage levels, which appear to have little to do with union organization, also enter the wage picture to some degree.

In the final analysis, must not the measure of wages, to be meaningful, be considered in terms of "real wages?" As to whether they are "low or high" must be decided in terms of what the wages will buy.

THE UNIONS CONTENT THAT RIGHT-TO-WORK IS A MISNOMER IN THAT IT DOES NOT GUARANTEE EMPLOYMENT

Granted, but unions cannot guarantee employment either. Productivity and capital investment in an atmosphere of voluntarism create the most dynamic employment opportunities. Restrictions, whether by labor or government policy, cause the employment opportunities to go elsewhere as in the case of jobs associated with steel wire products; that is, nails, barbed wire, et cetera. "Made in Belgium" now appears on many shipments received in the United States; and the job opportunities have gone overseas where, incidentally, there is a widespread dedication to the principle of voluntarism.

UNIONS CONTENT THAT THE MAJORITY WILL SHOULD BE IMPOSED ON ALL

Isn't this an attempt to equate the union with a sovereignty? We have long recognized the rightful place of majority decisions at the various levels of government, but the principle of voluntarism has prevailed otherwise in private organizations. Has the time come when labor unions are to be accorded the status and privileges of a sovereignty?

EXPOSURE TO UNIONS NOTWITHSTANDING, MANY WORKERS CHOOSE NOT TO BELONG

All of the reasons for this choice are not based on a desire to avoid dues and assessments; among the other reasons are:

First, confidence in the leadership of management; second, objections to the union leadership; third, objections to the union policies; fourth, objections due to conscience; fifth, objections based on religion; and sixth, objections to the union in principle.

In fact, 39 million of almost 56 million workers in nonagricultural establishments have not joined unions, and a substantial number of the nonjoiners have had many years of exposure to unionism.

In the event of repeal of 14(b), the union leaders will surely use their new power to insist on (and possibly get) a union shop in every bargaining situation. And those great numbers of employees who have elected to reject the union will be coerced, on pain of losing their employment, into the union fold against their wishes and in violation of their natural right to choose.



January 26, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A371

ORD the text of an editorial dated January 20, 1966, from the Michigan City, Ind., News-Dispatch, published in my own congressional district, which endorses President Johnson's recent proposal for a 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives.

The text of the editorial follows:

## FOUR-YEAR TERMS FOR CONGRESSMEN

President Johnson's proposal for a 4-year House term struck many Members as the most admirable idea they have heard from the White House since the last congressional pay raise.

The political rose that the Chief Executive offered the House in his state of the Union message looked good to many Members who hardly finish one campaign before starting another.

Under the Constitution, all 435 House seats are up for grabs every 2 years. In the 100-seat Senate, only 33 or 34 seats normally are at stake every 2 years and terms run for 6 years.

Thoughtful political scientists and campaign-weary politicians have been suggesting for years that the system be changed. But they never have had the kind of endorsement that Mr. Johnson gave.

As a result of Mr. Johnson's totally unexpected recommendation, a constitutional amendment providing for a 4-year House term probably will get early consideration.

Mr. Johnson said: "To strengthen the work of Congress I strongly urge an amendment to provide for a 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives—which should not begin before 1972."

"The present 2-year term requires most Members of Congress to divert enormous energies to an almost constant process of campaigning—depriving the Nation of the fullest measure of their skill and wisdom."

"Today, too, the work of Government is far more complex than in our early years, requiring more time to learn and master the technical tasks of legislation. And a longer term will serve to attract more men of the highest quality to political life. The Nation, the principle democracy, and each congressional district will be better served by a 4-year term. I urge your swift action."

During his speech Mr. Johnson was applauded 60 times. His reference to changing the 2-year terms to 4 years understandably drew the most vigorous applause.

It's a good suggestion and should be put into effect as soon as possible.

## It's Time for the Hard Particulars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, it is evident from today's headlines that some hard decisions are being made at the White House, not only for Congress but for the American people.

For those of us who sit outside that circle of leaders who have participated in the discussions at highest levels these past few days, this is proving to be a rather frustrating experience. I am sure we, all, recognize and respect the fact that the Constitution places upon the President the principal responsibility and authority for the conduct of not only our Nation's foreign policy but, in his

dual capacity as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, for the conduct of our national defense, as well. By an overwhelming vote, and well aware that he would have to be dealing with the crucial problems already then troubling us in Vietnam, the American people by an overwhelming vote in the last presidential election entrusted President Johnson with these awesome responsibilities.

I am sure that trust still prevails, even today when the need to choose the proper course to follow now in that complex and dangerous conflict has assumed proportions unthought of a scant 15 months ago.

Still, Mr. Speaker, this Congress—this House of Representatives—has a clear and constitutional responsibility, proportionately borne by each one of us alike in behalf of those individual citizens we represent, to assure itself that the decisions now so evidently being made are the right ones, both for America and for the cause of world peace with freedom.

It is because of my own individual awareness of my share in this responsibility that, on several occasions during the first session of this Congress, I urged that full hearings be held by the appropriate committees in this and the other body of Congress, for the purpose of going into and reviewing in depth and detail not only our more immediate problems in Vietnam but our whole policy, whatever it might be, in southeast Asia. Mr. Speaker, I again urge that this be done.

In doing so, I am fully aware of the present burdens—and the time problems—placed upon not only the President but on the Secretaries of State and Defense, as well as on our military people who are in charge of the day-to-day military operations in Vietnam. I do not wish to add to those burdens.

But I also wish to be assured that all the various options—or alternatives—available to us, if indeed there be any, have been fully and freely considered. At present, I have no way I know of for gaining that assurance, and I know full well that time, right now, does not permit us here in Congress to utilize the cumbersome committee system for such purposes.

Still, those of us who must needs sit here and wait, for now, can present some of those possible alternatives, or at least some contrasting viewpoints about the military aspects of Vietnam, for each other's consideration. In line, then, with that, I now include—under leave granted January 18 to extend my remarks and include extraneous material—the following column by Vermont Royster, as taken from the January 25 issue of the Wall Street Journal, commenting on the recent article written for Harper's magazine by Gen. James Gavin in which he presents some critical military questions concerning the war in Vietnam which questions, surely, should have our consideration:

THE GENERAL'S PARTICULARS  
(By Vermont Royster)

Gen. James Gavin's comments on the war in Vietnam, appearing in the current issue of Harper's, seem to have attracted a good

bit of public attention. Well they might, and well they ought.

For General Gavin is the first militarily knowledgeable person to discuss publicly the cold, hard military practicalities of that war, shunning sentiment, broad abstractions, or philosophic generalities.

Proceeding thusly, General Gavin comes to some conclusions about our military posture in Vietnam that are controversial, and must be very disturbing to those who will hear the general out.

In brief, he says that the military objective of freeing the entire country of South Vietnam from the Vietcong is stretching our military resources beyond all reason. To increase or extend the bombing of North Vietnam, or otherwise escalate the war, will, in his opinion, add to our problems rather than detract from them.

He proposes that we accept a much more limited objective which he thinks is feasible and practical. This is to deploy our forces not over the whole country but to hold several enclaves on the coast where our sea and air power can be fully effective. Presumably these would include Saigon for political reasons. As bases for military operations he mentions Danang and Cam Ranh Bay, places where we are already established.

This obviously offers no satisfaction to either those hawks eager to clobber the Vietcong even if it means taking on China, or to those doves who in the name of peace would have us come home and hand over the whole place to Communist Hanoi. Here is a general saying we must accept a substitute for victory.

This view of the war, however controversial, deserves everyone's thoughtful reflection, both because of the reasoned manner in which he arrives at it and because of the credentials of its author.

General Gavin is no newcomer to this vexing problem. Although perhaps better known recently as Ambassador to France, he has had a long and distinguished record as a soldier from private to general. In World War II he was a daring paratroop leader, but more to the present point he was Chief of Plans and Operations for the Army at the time of the French defeat and ouster from Vietnam.

At that time General Gavin was intimately involved in the decision whether to send U.S. forces into the Hanoi delta. The further that agonizing appraisal proceeded the more apparent it became that we would really be fighting not Hanoi but China, which would be providing the arms, ammunition and other supplies even if no troops.

That being the case, the military planners concluded that by any deep engagement in a land war in Vietnam we would be fighting China "in the wrong place on terms entirely to her advantage." This conclusion was presented to President Eisenhower, who concurred, and it was on the basis of this hard military analysis that the United States then decided not to intervene.

General Gavin is of the opinion that there is no reason now to alter that basic analysis. His military judgment is that today we are not only fighting the wrong war on the wrong terms but that we are exposing ourselves to grave military perils.

His reasoning is quite straightforward. The large forces we have committed there stretch thin every resource and leave our flanks exposed. If we enlarge them we can expect a reopening of the Korean front or an attack elsewhere, or both. "This seems to be," he writes, "the ultimate prospect of the course that we are now on."

He does not accept the so-called domino theory that a check on one battlefield would topple everything. "Economics, science and technology \* \* \* will in the long run serve our strategic interests well if we handle our national resources wisely. On the other hand, tactical mistakes that are allowed to

escalate at the initiative of an enemy could be disastrously costly."

A civilian will not find it easy to assess the correctness of this military judgment. Nonetheless, General Gavin has raised the right questions and joined the issue where it ought to be joined—namely, whether or not the present military policy in Vietnam makes military sense.

The country must, as General Gavin does, try to look at that war without myopia. The tactical problem mustn't be fuzzed up with sentiment or fears about injuries to pride or prestige; a general would be a fool who let pride keep him from withdrawing his troops to a ridge that would give himself, not the enemy, the advantages of the field. And we must be willing to see this particular battlefield in the context of an enduring strategic struggle over Asia.

In that long-range struggle the first objective is safeguarding the military strength of this country, the United States. That way, and only that way, can the United States serve as a shield of the civilized world.

It follows, then, that what weakens us weakens the shield, that any tactical mistakes "disastrously costly" to ourselves will be equally so to all who depend upon us for succor. It also follows, in General Gavin's phrase, that "we should be realistic about the course we are now on."

Being realistic does not mean being defeatist. It does not mean agreeing with General Gavin. It does not mean a reversal of the policy of resisting aggression in Vietnam. All it means is an honest effort to avoid military misjudgments fathered by pride.

Perhaps the present military leaders have a different military assessment of our tactical position in Vietnam. They may have military reasons to believe that the risk is not so grave, or that victory on this particular battlefield can be more easily achieved. In short, General Gavin may be wrong.

But if so, should we not hear the cold, realistic assessment of those presently entrusted with the military judgment? It is hardly enough just to say we "must" win because we are "pledged" or because we have a "moral duty." All can be lost in Pyrrhic victories.

With so much at stake it's time the debate moved from the easy generalities to the hard particulars.

### The Appointment of Dr. Robert C. Weaver

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. HENRY S. REUSS**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the 89th Congress created the Cabinet Department of Housing and Urban Development to deal with the urgent problems facing our great cities.

President Johnson searched long and hard to find the man best qualified to fill this post because he, too, recognized that our great cities are in crisis. Through his appointment of Dr. Robert C. Weaver, this new Department will reap the advantages of continuity, experience, and a broad view of the problems.

In an editorial praising President Johnson's appointment, the Milwaukee Journal called Dr. Weaver and his first assistant, Prof. Robert Wood, "a promis-

ing team to manage the very complex and terribly responsible job of fulfilling HUD's destiny to be a key Department in the Cabinet of a predominately urban Nation."

The full editorial, from the January 14, 1966, Milwaukee Journal, follows:

#### THE WEAVER APPOINTMENT

President Johnson has named the first Negro in history to the U.S. Cabinet. The choice of Robert Weaver had been publicly discussed and anticipated for several years. President Kennedy had said he would name him as soon as the Cabinet Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) was created, but the opportunity fell to Johnson instead.

The fact that Weaver is a Negro cannot help but stand out in this country and in the world. It is a milestone in the history of his race and a splendid personal achievement by himself.

It is vital to observe, however, that he is not being elevated to this unprecedented eminence because he is of the minority race. He has worked for it and earned it on his own, as a skilled and experienced public official for more than 30 years. With a Harvard Ph. D. in economics, he became a public housing administrator in the New Deal, has both administered and taught in the fields of housing and urban renewal ever since—most recently, of course, as head of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, which has become the new HUD.

As a onetime head of the National Association for the Advancement Colored People, his credentials as a civil rightist are complete. The thing about this is that he has also proved his complete integrity as an administrator on behalf of people. He has been just as "color blind" as any white official would have been expected to be, and this is publicly recognized even in southern quarters of the Senate that must confirm him.

The President did put his individual stamp on the manning of HUD by imaginatively choosing Prof. Robert Wood of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology to be Weaver's right-hand man. The brilliant young Young may well be the Nation's top academic expert in the field of urban affairs.

It looks like a promising team to manage the very complex and terribly responsible job of fulfilling HUD's destiny to be a key department in the Cabinet of a predominantly urban nation.

### The President's Annual Message

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. JOHN J. RHODES**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, with his usual incisive style, W. R. Mathews, long-time editor and publisher of the Arizona Daily Star of Tucson, has analyzed the President's state of the Union message. Mr. Mathews presents thoughts which I feel should be brought to the attention of all Members.

The article follows:

[From the Tucson (Ariz.) Daily Star, Jan. 14, 1966]

#### THE PRESIDENT'S ANNUAL MESSAGE

The state of the Union message, such as that delivered by President Johnson before

Congress Wednesday, has become by custom an annual event in the life of our country. Although Presidents have done this since the beginning of our country, it was President Woodrow Wilson who started the custom of appearing before Congress in person to deliver it.

Actually, according to the Constitution, every message that the President addresses publicly to Congress is a state of the Union message. The Constitution, article II, section 3, reads as follows: "He shall from time to time give to the Congress information of the state of the Union, and recommended to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient."

President Johnson's Wednesday night message was literally a state of the Union one. He covered the waterfront without missing anything, and made plain that the status of domestic affairs shall come ahead of everything else. Nearly every organized minority will get what it seeks, while every social welfare project initiated by him and passed by Congress will be continued without any reduction in appropriations.

He has become the first President to call for the adoption of a constitutional amendment authorizing a 4-year term for Members of the House in place of the present 2-year term. This is a wise and badly needed reform. The shocking increase in the cost of political campaigning every 2 years alone justifies the change. If Congress itself will pass the legislation, it probably will get a quick ratification by the State legislatures.

His suggestion that our foreign trade be liberalized so that there can be increased trade between our country and the countries of Eastern Europe, is also a wise suggestion, although it is an unpopular idea in some sectors of American life.

He asks for "new measures to enable us effectively to deal with strikes, which threaten irreparable damage to the public interest." He offsets that unpleasant note to labor bosses by again urging repeal of that controversial section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law, which would nullify right-to-work laws in 19 States, of which Arizona is one.

Although the war in Vietnam has become one of the most bewildering and pressing issues before the American people, he adds not one thing new to what he has said in the past, and by his silence on the bombing of North Vietnam indicates that his present policy of no bombing there shall continue. As usual, he pleads for peace, just as nearly every American does; but most Americans know from history that when they get involved in a war, their armies have to do more than just stand guard and give sanctuary from bombing to the country of the enemy we are fighting.

Continuation of this soft, indecisive policy in the name of peace defies the experiences of history. When in history has such a restrained military policy brought peace? It has been mistaken as a sign of weakness, which our enemy sees confirmed by the various pacifist demonstrations in our country.

North Vietnam will have no reason to answer the President's constant overtures about negotiation and peace, until it is hurt and hurt badly. The industrial complex of North Vietnam must be destroyed. Life in the cities of North Vietnam must be paralyzed by bombing. This must be done until the Communist leaders of North Vietnam plead for peace.

Wars cannot be fought with feather dusters, as, figuratively, we are doing now. We have to use our battleaxes. Our Army, Navy, and Air Force must unleash their power and make war. Not until we do, will there be the slightest chance of peace.

We must not be tricked by agreeing to restrict our warmaking abilities by any offer of negotiations. Certainly if any offer is